



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 23143

Title: Valgus osteotomy for nonunion and neglected neck of femur fractures

Reviewer’s code: 02699716

Reviewer’s country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-12-09 11:25

Date reviewed: 2015-12-15 17:02

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

Dear editor, below you may find my comments: General The paper is nice to read and interesting. Only few changes are required, some of them are minor text corrections. I personally think the author, who has a great experience with this procedure, may add more tips and tricks and the personal modification to the surgical technique to make the paper outstanding. Abstract Abstract is well written and no suggestion may be given. Introduction Introduction is well written and no changes are required. Operative procedure I would suggest changing the first sentence of the paragraph “reduction and stabilization”: closed reduction in case of non-union or neglected fracture would be difficult. I would change the term “should be obtained” into “should be attempted”. Furthermore an excessive force on the neck may stretch and injury the retinaculum (which is less mobile because of the surrounding scar tissue), I would suggest the author to mention this in the paper. Potential pitfalls I think those paragraphs may be improved and the author, who has a big experience with this procedure, will have no difficulties doing that. Controversies I would suggest to change the title “valgus vs total hip arthroplasty” into “valgus osteotomies vs total hip arthroplasty”. Few sentences about the difficulties in performing a THA after intertrochanteric



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>

osteotomy should be added. "Not all the patient who develop AVN are symptomatic" requires a reference. Prognostic factors affecting outcome I would reword the sentence "Distinguishing... practice". "Head size of < 2.5 cm"? Is the author taking about femoral head diameter?



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: 23143

Title: Valgus osteotomy for nonunion and neglected neck of femur fractures

Reviewer's code: 02709664

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-12-09 11:25

Date reviewed: 2015-12-21 01:41

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"/> 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 checked="" 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

Overall, a well written article, and easy to read. But, the methods of this review are missing. Where did you find the article for this review? What terms and key-words did you use? In Operative procedure section, the text seems to be an expert opinion. Of course, the author is expert, but he has to support the indications reported in the text with literature. This review appears to me as a paragraph of a book for residents in orthopedic surgery. Every single sentence has to reflect both the conclusions of great impact article and the author experience. I think the author experience is well described, but the other part is missing. I encourage the author to complete his review as suggested. Best regards, Stefano Carbone