



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 39967

**Title:** Long-term results of an anatomically implanted hip arthroplasty with a short stem prosthesis (MiniHip™)

**Reviewer's code:** 02706155

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-05-23

**Date reviewed:** 2018-05-24

**Review time:** 1 Day

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I appreciate the latest research about the novel design of Hip prosthesis and the surprising results. A lot of new concepts was offered from this manuscript. I suggest authors supplement detailed demographic data for the enrolled patients. Is there any



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

correlation between the patients' age/career/activity/BMI and lossening rate? I wish 1 or 2 tables help readers to acquire more information about the prothesis.

#### **INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT**

##### ***Google Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No

##### ***BPG Search:***

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism
- [Y] No



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 39967

**Title:** Long-term results of an anatomically implanted hip arthroplasty with a short stem prosthesis (MiniHip™)

**Reviewer’s code:** 03065412

**Reviewer’s country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2018-05-23

**Date reviewed:** 2018-05-27

**Review time:** 4 Days

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer’s expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Overall, I think this study provides the reader with novel information regarding the long term survival and outcome of this prosthesis, and so justifies its publication. There are however a number of points, I feel should be addressed, prior to it being accepted: 1) I



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

would call this 'nine year' survival data - 'nine to ten years' sounds cumbersome 2) The results section in the abstract should provide a more succinct summary of the results - e.g. the sentence 'Moreover, bony hypertrophies and/or bone appositions which might be indicative for a distal loading, were frequently noticed.' is too vague. 3) The analysis regarding 'outcome vs age' is not clear - this should be better described in the Methods and Results. 4) Bilateral THRs have been coded as single procedures - 'A total of 186 consecutive hip joint arthroplasties (right/left/bilateral = 90/82/14) in 186 patients (m/f = 94/92)' - surely they should count as two procedures, or this is just presented confusingly. 5) At times the language is confusing e.g. 'Other major complications, such as dislocations, periprosthetic fractures, a deep venous thrombosis and nerve injuries were not documented.' Does this mean they were not recorded, or they did not occur? This is obviously a substantial difference, but difficult to determine given the language used. 6) In the abstract, 'The clinical follow-up was accompanied by standardized p.a. and axial radiological examinations.' should be 'The clinical follow-up was accompanied by standardized a.p. and axial radiological examinations.' 7) In the results section, the sentences 'A small osteolysis of less than 2 mm outlined by a discrete sclerotic margin was detected in a large number of patients around the tip of the stem. This finding was only noticed in Gruen zones 3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 12 in 16, 47, 54, 36, 21 and 31 cases, respectively.' are confusing. This would be better presented in a table. 8) The Discussion is generally well written but is too long - this should be reduced to 3 pages maximum.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- The same title
- Duplicate publication
- Plagiarism



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,  
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**Fax:** +1-925-223-8243  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

[Y] No

***BPG Search:***

[ ] The same title

[ ] Duplicate publication

[ ] Plagiarism

[Y] No