

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 25319

Title: Trochanter/calcar preserving reconstruction in tumors involving the femoral head and neck

Reviewer's code: 02446319

Reviewer's country: South Korea

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-04 16:18

Date reviewed: 2016-03-07 19:11

| 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 checked="" 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 | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision |
| | | BPG Search: | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | |
| | | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | |
| | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | |

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have received your literature. The effort to reduce postoperative morbidity by preserving trochanter and calcar seemed to have yielded a good result. however I have some question about the benefit from preserving calcar, and as you have previously described, the number of cases is limited. A comparison of clinical outcome between trochanter/calcar preserving reconstruction and total femur reconstruction will be concluded better report result. I believe this method could be applied to selected patients.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 25319

Title: Trochanter/calcar preserving reconstruction in tumors involving the femoral head and neck

Reviewer's code: 02695138

Reviewer's country: Croatia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2016-03-04 16:18

Date reviewed: 2016-03-15 21:19

| 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"/> 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

1. I do not understand following statement:" After the planned intertrochanteric osteotomy, attachments of vastus muscles and psoas and the anterior capsule were detached from the proximal segment to remove the proximal segment." Please provide more details how this detachment is achieved and how much resection below the tip of greater trochanter was achieved in every case. 2. Please provide one case (X rays) with greatest resection (lowest point on the lesser trochanter) 3. Please provide specific details, explanation how this osteotomy differs from any other resection of the femoral neck during THA and what is new in this approach.