ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
ESPS manuscript NO: 21274
Title: Reverse-total shoulder arthroplasty cost-effectiveness: A quality-adjusted life years comparison with total hip arthroplasty
Reviewer's code: 01200726
Reviewer's country: Japan
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-07-09 15:13
Date reviewed: 2015-07-21 20:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[Y] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good		[ ] Duplicate publication	
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study compared reverse-total shoulder arthroplasty cost-effectiveness with total hip arthroplasty cost-effectiveness, and concluded that cost/ Quality-adjusted life year (QALY) estimates supported both reverse-total shoulder arthroplasty and total hip arthroplasty cost-effectiveness. Could the authors delete Figures 1 and 3?

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
ESPS manuscript NO: 21274
Title: Reverse-total shoulder arthroplasty cost-effectiveness: A quality-adjusted life years comparison with total hip arthroplasty
Reviewer's code: 02444740
Reviewer's country: Israel
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-07-09 15:13
Date reviewed: 2015-09-12 13:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a nice paper , minor corrections are needed