



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 26350

**Title:** Prosthetic design of reverse shoulder arthroplasty contributes to scapular notching and instability

**Reviewer's code:** 03070252

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-04-13 14:37

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-15 03:23

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 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

Low level evidence, but does offer clinically relevant information for surgeons performing reverse shoulder arthroplasty. In the introduction, please elaborate on why notching is clinically relevant since notching rates is one of your primary outcomes. Please explain glenoid grading system and notching grading system. Finally, you had a thorough discussion of the study limitations, but did not mention that the senior author started with the Grammont-type prosthesis and then switched to the lateral-based prosthesis. This is a source of bias that could have allowed for improved outcomes in the lateral-based group and should be mentioned.



# 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

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 26350

**Title:** Prosthetic design of reverse shoulder arthroplasty contributes to scapular notching and instability

**Reviewer's code:** 03069278

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Jin-Xin Kong

**Date sent for review:** 2016-04-13 14:37

**Date reviewed:** 2016-04-16 12:27

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

RTSA It is a topical issue and increasingly popular. Your paper confirms the existing practice and concurs with available evidence. Please can you provide following clarifications: 1. You have excluded 131 cases from 196, quite a big number. In particular, 57 cases were excluded due to failed arthroplasty. That's almost as big a group as you have included in your analysis. Were these cases excluded because, in your opinion, none of these cases failed due to notching or dislocation? What was the breakup of these cases according to your design group?