

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 17305

Title: Operative vs non-operative management of displaced proximal humeral fractures in the elderly: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer's code: 00503638

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2015-03-02 18:14

Date reviewed: 2015-05-10 04:07

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

There are plenty of papers regarding this topic had been published earlier, there is no new information in this manuscript

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 17305

Title: Operative vs non-operative management of displaced proximal humeral fractures in the elderly: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Reviewer's code: 03397014

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xiu-Xia Song

Date sent for review: 2015-03-02 18:14

Date reviewed: 2015-06-06 22:23

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" 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"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for inviting me to review this manuscript. Overview Variables – Operative v.s non-operative management of humerus fracture Outcome measures – physical function, pain, HRQoL, Mortality, re-operation rate Methods – Systematic review and meta-analysis 6 RCT's included – main findings – no dif in function, hrqol, or mortality, but operative management is associated with higher re-operation rate (obviously) and reduced pain. In summary, the operative group must undergo 1 or more operations, but this is likely to reduce pain long term. Minor comment – abstract – not valid to have re-operation rate as outcome measure if one of the groups is non-operative. Intro Previous work looks at same question (which systematic review? Refs 11, 16,17?), but without all encompassing methodology, or appropriate statistical methods (as stated by authors). Very clear objectives – transparent about previous work. Methods What were your search terms (see appendix 1) can they go in prose? How were rater differences resolved? By consensus with whom? Long term outcomes 12m+, can there be changes in function after 12m? Excellent methodology – logical and thorough – well described Results Well-structured prose related to



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

outcome measures. Reduced pain in abstract was only different in outcome, but further analysis show that this is unclear. Figures The graphical quality of the flow chart appears poor. May be useful to know why the majority of papers were excluded within the chart Discussion Question mark of pain outcome is well worded in the discussion. Final remarks If the main contribution of this work is that it improves on the methodology of the previous reviews, it would be helpful to report the findings of the other reviews. And whilst it may be better quality evidence, it is not the most exciting contribution to the literature should your conclusions turn out to be identical to previous reviews. One of the previous reviews is a Cochrane review – which should be of good quality – what were the results of this review and where were the limitations in the methodology? Whilst this paper is very well written, and has strong methodology, it is not clear if this adds to the literature