

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17782

**Title:** Subtrochanteric fractures after retrograde femoral nailing

**Reviewer's code:** 00728561

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-26 18:40

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-03 15:59

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

Excellent work with this unusual complication. Just a question. Could you include the number of retrograde nails that you use by year in your centre? With two cases you can know how frequency is that complication.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17782

**Title:** Subtrochanteric fractures after retrograde femoral nailing

**Reviewer's code:** 03069451

**Reviewer's country:** Italy

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-26 18:40

**Date reviewed:** 2015-06-03 22:22

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"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

This manuscript presents a well-written report of two cases with a rare complications of retrograde femoral nailing. The topic is curious and interesting for the orthopedic community. As reported by the Authors, there are few data in literature that describe this complication, its treatment and outcome. However I suggest to add a table that include all other similar cases; Moreover there are some grammatical mistakes, probably caused by inattention, and there is a need of revision from an English native-language (even if there are some Authors from Virginia). In my opinion there is too pictures that should be merged in few clearly images. Nonunion is one of the most common complication of diaphyseal femoral fracture and this could be the cause of other biomechanical problems, including a fracture in locus minori resistentia. In the second case I'm not able to see a union of the fracture and this could be the cause of the fracture at the end of the nail. This concept should be widely analysed in the discussion The manuscript could be consider for publication after revision

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 17782

**Title:** Subtrochanteric fractures after retrograde femoral nailing

**Reviewer's code:** 00467045

**Reviewer's country:** Australia

**Science editor:** Yue-Li Tian

**Date sent for review:** 2015-03-26 18:40

**Date reviewed:** 2015-04-29 16:56

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 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 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

This is a good paper and generally well-written. The topic is of interest to the readers of the WJO. There are a few grammatical changes needed, for example, there are additional commas need to be removed. Specific comments are stated below: 1. Introduction, Lines 108-112: The sentence 'The last two decades have witnessed' should be 'In the last two decades, a significant increase... has been witnessed' or similar. 2. Introduction, Lines 116-117: The first sentence is not clear and should be reworded. 3. Case 1, Lines 131-132: Can the authors please reword this to make it clear that the burst fracture and the screw fixation of the right femoral neck were also a result of the previous skydiving accident? 4. Case 1, Line 140: The word 'A' is needed before 'CT scan confirmed...' 5. Case 1, Line 159: The word 'the' is needed before 'hip and knee.' 6. Discussion: The references to the previous papers would be better worded as, for example (on Lines 254-255), 'In a prospective randomised controlled trial, Ostrum et al. compared the results...'