

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 19619

Title: Conversion total hip arthroplasty: Primary or revision total hip arthroplasty

Reviewer's code: 02903665

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-05-16 19:21

Date reviewed: 2015-05-22 23:45

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I enjoyed reading the editorial. I might put in some detail about the success rates of fix and HHA replace and THA replace vs conversion THA. There was a good systematic review i believe in BMJ a few years back. The findings were quite interesting. The hip fracture THA is clearly a different animal than the garden variety THA for OA. The authors make a compelling arguement that CMS should recognize it as such. The bit about success rates may help frame the argument a bit.