PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[Y] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for inviting me to review this experimental study on the use of Ilizarov leg lengthening in dogs. The topic is interesting and the study may have a point. However, the text is difficult to follow and the key points are not emphasized. Beginning from the abstract, the readers cannot tell regarding the groups, methods and purposes of the study. At the Introduction section, the authors should provide the conflicts of the literature and what is missing for these to merit publication. The materials and methods should be reorganized and the results should be divided in respective paragraphs each of which should begin with a key statement of the important finding. The discussion should avoid any irrelevant generalities and focus on the methods for distraction. Illustrations are far too many; please reduce to the most interesting. In general, the text is too extensive for the information provided and should be shortened to 1/3.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
Manuscript NO: 32957
Title: Benefits of Ilizarov automated bone distraction for nerves and articular cartilage in experimental leg lengthening
Reviewer's code: 02699853
Reviewer's country: Spain
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2017-06-21
Date reviewed: 2017-07-01

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	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[ ] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[Y] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Congratulations for your interesting work and good quality study. I have some concerns: 1. Please clarify the deadlines used in each of the stages of the study. It is expressed in a way that lends itself to confusion. 2. Why do you use 29 dogs? There is some statistical reason to do so? What is the power of the study? 3. Specify why have you performed the assessment of tissue response in the way you have done? 4. Who did this evaluation?

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
Manuscript NO: 32957
Title: Benefits of Ilizarov automated bone distraction for nerves and articular cartilage in experimental leg lengthening
Reviewer's code: 03068027
Reviewer's country: United Kingdom
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2017-06-21
Date reviewed: 2017-07-02

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting manuscript with regards to the argument of bone lengthening with the ilizarov method.
Some points need to be mentioned:
1) Tittle needs to be changed
"Benefits of Ilizarov distraction for nerves and articular cartilage in experimental leg lengthening" does not reflect the conclusion regarding the advantages of automated bone distraction.
2) The discussion section is short and needs to be expanded with more info
3) Severe language improvement from professionals needed
4) Why did you use the D28, F30, WA30 points? Particularly you don t say anything about the F30 (bone regeneration consolidate?), please explain further when is the above point and why chosen.
5) Table 2 and 3, 4 do not support any significant difference between groups with

automated vs manual distraction. Please comment on that

6) Same group 5 shows only partial advantage of automated distraction

Overall significant improvement needs to be done. Is really supported your conclusion that automated distraction is more advantageous or not?