

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 30969

Title: Predicting Lower Limb Periprosthetic Joint Infections: A Review of Risk Factors and Their Classification

Reviewer's code: 03675863

Reviewer's country: United States

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-10-28 09:25

Date reviewed: 2016-11-08 07:18

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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" 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

The authors present a well-written meta-analysis assessing the factors related to PJI after total hip or knee surgery. They find that patient-related risk factors are the most significant, these including preoperative steroids, BMI>50, tobacco use, BMI less than 20, DM, CAD and revision status of the procedure. This manuscript, at 1700 words, is the start to an excellent paper, however, I believe before proceeding with publication, more detail should be added to the script. The introduction requires references for the statements made in the first sentence of the first paragraph and the first sentence of the second paragraph. No numbered lines were given, so I have to reference using that language. In the second to last paragraph of the methods, the Prisma model should be referenced. The result section require significantly more detail. While the tables are referred, the most significant data should be presented (as the tables are not self explanatory). With only 1700 words in the script, the authors have room to add. The results with CI and p-values in the discussion should be presented in the results section. The discussion should be limited to discussing those highlights again, but the statistics should be in the results section. Please review the factors specific to provider not



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>

only in the results, but in the conclusion. One factor that has recently been shown to affect outcomes is surgical time. Please indicate whether you found this to be true. Overall a great study, but polishing and bolstering the results and discussion section is necessary for publication.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 30969

Title: Predicting Lower Limb Periprosthetic Joint Infections: A Review of Risk Factors and Their Classification

Reviewer's code: 03609779

Reviewer's country: France

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-10-28 09:25

Date reviewed: 2016-11-09 00:07

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 checked="" 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		<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

In this manuscript authors reviewed provider risk factors of chronic PJI. This study is interesting and the objective very clear. I commend the authors for collecting all this data. I have the following remarks: -Main host related factors are well known and described in previous studies. -the choice of risk factors should be discussed: Especially infectious diseases risk factors. Nasal MRSA infection is selected but what about the other risk factors? Nasal S. aureus infection, distant organ infection, genitourinary infection? -factors of immunosuppression remain unclear: what about prednisone use? -there are no data about patients with chronic renal failure. Most of the time there are only one article selected to evaluate each risk factor. It has to be compared to other main studies especially regarding infectious risk factors. This study could be completed and focused in order to highlight new messages.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 30969

Title: Predicting Lower Limb Periprosthetic Joint Infections: A Review of Risk Factors and Their Classification

Reviewer's code: 03518606

Reviewer's country: Germany

Science editor: Shui Qiu

Date sent for review: 2016-10-28 09:25

Date reviewed: 2016-11-04 00:46

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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Dear authors, your study is well designed and clearly structured. However I miss quality assessment criteria for inclusion of the individual studies. Results are a little too short and the discussion section should include other meta-analysis and reviews published 2015 and 2016.