

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27218

**Title:** Management of syndesmotom injuries: What is the evidence?

**Reviewer's code:** 01220036

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-19 11:04

**Date reviewed:** 2016-05-20 01:38

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

accepted

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27218

**Title:** Management of syndesmotom injuries: What is the evidence?

**Reviewer's code:** 02699758

**Reviewer's country:** Japan

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-19 11:04

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-18 08:57

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 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 checked="" 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

The authors demonstrated the overview for diagnosis and treatment of ankle syndesmotom injuries. This paper is concise and well written. I recommend this manuscript is accepted with following minor revisions. 1. I agree with the use of 3.5 or 4.5 mm cortical screws for syndesmotom injury. Do the authors have any comment on the time of screw removal? 2. Bioabsorbable screws are also used for fixation of distal tibiofibular joint. Those are no need for removal, and there might be no problem if those are broken during weight bearing. Do the authors have any comment on the use of bioabsorbable screws?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27218

**Title:** Management of syndesmotom injuries: What is the evidence?

**Reviewer's code:** 02689728

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-19 11:04

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-20 05:21

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 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 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

well written.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 27218

**Title:** Management of syndesmotom injuries: What is the evidence?

**Reviewer's code:** 00739181

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Xue-Mei Gong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-05-19 11:04

**Date reviewed:** 2016-06-26 02:56

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 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 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

Management of syndesmotom injuries is always the hot topic in the orthopaedic conference. There are many different views of diagnosis and treatment of the injury, and no consensus has reached in many issues about this injury. So, it is valuable to discuss this topic. The object of the article is to provide a current concepts review of the clinical presentation, diagnosis and treatment of syndesmotom injuries, and to supply some evidence in treating the injury. But in my opinion, there are some deficiencies in the article. 1. There are different views in diagnosis and treatment of the injury, and no consensus has reached in many areas, such as diagnosis before and in operation, fixation types, evaluation of the reduction in operation and hardware removal, et al. The author should lay out some important contemporary views. For example, as to intraoperative assessment of reduction of syndesmosis, open reduction of syndesmosis or comparing the X-ray views to another normal ankle are also important, which are accepted by many surgeons. But the author only focuses on 3-D CT which is somewhat not so popular nowadays. 2. For the Radiographs, AP, lateral and mortise views may be not enough to evaluate the injury. The gravity stress view before and in the operation is also important. Can the author address this more detailedly? 3. Hardware removal is also the matter. The authors did not



## 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](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

mention about the hardware removal or not, when to remove, complications after removal and complications when not removal, but all these are the matters that orthopaedic surgeons care about. 4. Rigid fixation and elastic fixation of syndesmosis are the types that used in the injury, and there are controversial points. The authors only related to the Tightrope fixation. Can the authors analyze and compare the two fixations in detail.