

Conclusion:	Accept	(General	priority)
Scientific	Quality:	Grade	C
Language Quality:	Grade B (Minor language polishing)		

GRAMMATICAL ERRORS HAVE BEEN FIXED

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? **This is a review of the literature but lack of systematic approach. It is not a systematic review, it is a guest editorial and has been realized as a guest editorial.**

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? NA

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? NA

7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Yes, Several topics may be improved. Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? **No, a systematic review would be preferred. But this manuscript is a guest editorial.** Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? NA

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? No

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? **Yes a part from blood units, that do not require SI units**

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Yes Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? No

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? The quality may be improved changing the structure Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes although minor typing mistakes should be corrected

13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? No

14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? NA First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? NA What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? NA What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? NA What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through

experiments in this study? NA Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? The topic is interesting

What are the new findings of this study? The new findings are not so well presented. What are the new concepts that this study proposes? NA What are the new methods that this study proposed? NA Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? Yes **What are the unique insights that this study presented? Diagnosis and treatment of severely traumatised patients managed with DCO**

What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? The study tried to solve an important question but the lack of high quality study severely impacts the review

Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? **I would suggest to change it to a systematic review.** NA this manuscript is a guest editorial. What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? This part may be added in the study

What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? Several questions on this topic are still unanswered but do not limit the importance of this study What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? This part may be added in the text

How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice? It will not change the clinical practice but it is interesting for the average orthopaedic surgeon.

Conclusion:	Minor			revision
Scientific	Quality:	Grade	B	(Very good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)				

GRAMMATICAL ERRORS HAVE BEEN FIXED

the paper : Damage Control Orthopaedics. State of the Art is well written I agree with the approach of the authors and putting clear that , the stretch of indication and the unclear limits of the use of DCO

Conclusion:	Minor			revision
Scientific	Quality:	Grade	C	(Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)				