Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 74560

Title: DISTAL FEMUR COMPLEX FRACTURES IN ELDERLY PATIENTS TREATED WITH MEGAPROSTHESIS: RESULTS IN A CASE SERIES OF ELEVEN PATIENTS

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 02694731

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Doctor, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Switzerland

Author’s Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-29

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-07 11:52

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-12 11:13

Review time: 4 Days and 23 Hours

### Scientific quality
- [Y] Grade A: Excellent
- [ ] Grade B: Very good
- [ ] Grade C: Good
- [ ] Grade D: Fair
- [ ] Grade E: Do not publish

### Language quality
- [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing
- [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
- [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing
- [ ] Grade D: Rejection

### Conclusion
- [Y] Accept (High priority)
- [ ] Accept (General priority)
- [ ] Minor revision
- [ ] Major revision
- [ ] Rejection

### Re-review
- [Y] Yes
- [ ] No
SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
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Dear Authors: Thank you very much for your dedication and effort in this work, here are some ideas to improve your manuscript:

- The introduction is correct, however in the material and methods section you should specify certain aspects more. Why do you consider over 85 years of age as an inclusion criterion? You should describe it. How do you carry out the study of the sample of 11 patients, why? How do you include the 10 women and one man, why? You should expand on this information.

- They say that they carry out a subsequent follow-up, but they do not describe how this follow-up is carried out, at home, by telephone, outpatient, etc. They should describe it.

- In the results they describe that there is improvement in all the variables studied, but in my point of view they should express these favourable changes as a percentage of change or as an index of minimum change or something similar that could fit in this section. Otherwise, this section would lack statistical analysis, even if it is simple, they should add it to justify that scientific evidence in their treatment.

Regards.