

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21874

**Title:** Footwear modification following hallux valgus surgery: The all-or-none phenomenon

**Reviewer's code:** 03065771

**Reviewer's country:** Germany

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-06 15:38

**Date reviewed:** 2016-01-25 22:56

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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good clinical trial, but I have some comments: 1) Please provide a significant hypothesis. It is necessary to provide a hypothesis to conclude a significant take-home-message for the readership. 2) Try avoid information in per cent in a population less than 100. 3) The discussion has to end with the limitations of your study. Please try to postulate them exactly. 4) The conclusion has to be completely rewritten. Please avoid repeating results of your study, but give a significant and short take-home-message.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21874

**Title:** Footwear modification following hallux valgus surgery: The all-or-none phenomenon

**Reviewer's code:** 00505410

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-06 15:38

**Date reviewed:** 2016-02-02 11:32

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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 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

This is a well written study with straightforward methodology and results. I found the introduction and discussion to be thorough and helpful. Only comment is I didn't understand the logic behind this statement in the discussion: " Additionally, this could explain the finding that retirement age patients were also twice as likely to report significant restriction." Is this because Lapidus was more common in the >65 group?

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Methodology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 21874

**Title:** Footwear modification following hallux valgus surgery: The all-or-none phenomenon

**Reviewer's code:** 03065412

**Reviewer's country:** United Kingdom

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2015-08-06 15:38

**Date reviewed:** 2015-11-22 19:48

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	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

Nil additional