

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 28847

Title: Return to physical activity after gastrocnemius recession

Reviewer's code: 02744121

Reviewer's country: Brazil

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-07-21 11:55

Date reviewed: 2016-07-22 02:16

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input checked="" 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

Dear author, It is a well conducted retrospective cohort study entitled: " Return to Physical activity after Gastrocnemius Recession" I like many things about this manuscript, I believe that these findings are really great. It is an important and current issue and the message can best be adressed to orthopedists worldwide. The introduction section was nice done. The hypothesis was well presented and The primary aim and the secondary aim are clear. The methods section was nicely described and statistical analysis is clear. I would suggest that author should named this section Methods without Materials. The results section and tables are concise and clear. The conclusion is supported by the data.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 28847

Title: Return to physical activity after gastrocnemius recession

Reviewer's code: 02508408

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-07-21 11:55

Date reviewed: 2016-07-23 22:54

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting research article on the return to physical activity after gastrocnemius recession procedure. In general, the methodology is appropriate, the results are clinically significant, and the implications for clinical practice is quite useful.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 28847

Title: Return to physical activity after gastrocnemius recession

Reviewer's code: 00505431

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-07-21 11:55

Date reviewed: 2016-07-25 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 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

Enjoyed reading this study, and appreciate all the time and effort for such a meticulous assessment. Page 6, line 13. Would like to see the spread of ages.....was 83 an outlier? Page 8, line 11 and in discussion section, page 10, line 24: I am surprised that it took so long to get back to work. Perhaps this has to do with elements related to the "system"...for example I would expect patients who were self-employed and worked at a desk job to get back to work much sooner, versus those who worked construction or when there are special work programs for leave of absence or for workers compensation that might promote a later return to work? It's difficult to assess secondary gain Page 11, line 17. I agree that it is highly unlikely that another technique would be less invasive or likely to have less morbidity. I do Strayer's in peds population and find that even the open is minimally invasive. Could consider putting Tables 4 and 5 together, so that reader could see the preop/1 yr/2 yrs data side by side? This would conserve space and make it easier for reader to digest the information.