



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6581

Title: Current and future medical therapeutic strategies for the functional repair of spinal cord injury

Reviewer code: 02444789

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-25 18:43

Date reviewed: 2013-11-28 18:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

My specific comments have been added to the attached uploaded document. In brief, I thought this was an interesting read. My comments for improvement are: You need to add some diagrams to explain the pathophysiology and mechanisms of action of drugs. This is an area surgeons will not be familiar. You need to be more critical of the evidence and suggest how future trials can tackle these problems to provide useful information. minor language changes. improve the abstract - the colleagues I showed it to said they would not read this article if they read that abstract. I agree. I look forward to your revisions.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6581

Title: Current and future medical therapeutic strategies for the functional repair of spinal cord injury

Reviewer code: 00501328

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-25 18:43

Date reviewed: 2013-11-30 18:52

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Interesting paper. What is the aim of your review? What this review may bring to orthopedic surgeons? Please specify it at the end of your Abstract and in Discussion. Please add an Introduction chapter to outline current evidence on this topic and aim of your review. I would suggest authors to add one Table to summarize main findings (key points) of your review. This will help the reader to get a coincide "take home message" of your review. Similarly, one Table including most significant papers (a selection of 5 paper out of 128 provided) should be provided. There are no images nor diagrams. Can author provide diagrams/pictures of pathophysiology of spinal cord injury and corticosteroids mechanism of action (theories)? This will help readers not familiar with this topic as not all orthopedic surgeons deal with SCI and are familiar with its pathophysiology. Moreover, case examples with radiographs are always appreciated. Overall, I found this a well written article with valid points. It is a very good manuscript to provide a comprehensive review of medical therapeutic strategies for functional repair of SCI.



Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,
315-321 Lockhart Road, Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 6581

Title: Current and future medical therapeutic strategies for the functional repair of spinal cord injury

Reviewer code: 02444787

Science editor: Ma, Ya-Juan

Date sent for review: 2013-10-25 18:43

Date reviewed: 2013-12-05 16:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Wee-written paper but some minor revisions should be done: Page 5 2nd paragraph 'A systematic review' should be corrected as 'In a systematic review' Sentence starting with ' by considering' should be revised accordingly Conclusion part should be more brief and last sentence of conclusion should be removed.