



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 16369

Title: Surgical interventions for shoulder instability in rugby players: a systematic review

Reviewer’s code: 00741523

Reviewer’s country: Greece

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-01-18 12:52

Date reviewed: 2015-01-27 04:43

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input 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"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" 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		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

GENERAL COMMENTS This paper is a systematic review of surgical interventions for shoulder instability in rugby players. Unfortunately, there are only six low quality studies to assess this topic and as the authors pointed out quantitative analysis was not possible, and therefore it is difficult to address this specific clinical/research question. In addition, the authors should try to make the clinical question more specific (e.g evaluate only surgical treatment of anterior shoulder instability in order to avoid confusion) and include in their review only papers with anterior shoulder instability. Finally, I suggest that the authors should report clearly, in the Results section, IN TOTAL, demographic data of the study population (age, sex, mean age at surgery e.t.c) the total rate of recurrence, mean time to return to rugby, e.t.c. This will help the reader to have a clear idea of the total study population Finally, there are other issues that need to be addressed (see below).

INTRODUCTION Page 5, lines 83-88. These are general and very well known anatomic info and it is not necessary to report them here. In this way you can save some space and provide the necessary background for shoulder instability in athletes.

METHODS Page 7 -inclusion exclusion criteria. I



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

think you should report that only studies that described surgical intervention and not “treatment intervention” were included. To my opinion, as I pointed out in my general comments you should be more specific and include only anterior instability cases to draw useful conclusions. Please define the required time of follow-up. Page 7, lines 146-147. “year of publication” is double. Please delete one. RESULTS I think you should organize your results in a more clear way. For example you do not report what is the mean Rowe score (in the running text), or the total rate of recurrence in chronic and acute cases, differences between arthroscopic and open techniques, or differences between soft tissue and Latarjet reconstructions. By analysing each of the studies separately, the reader is difficult to have the overall impression of the problem. Please define if acute anterior instability is the same with first time dislocation. Please report the mean Coleman score and how many studies were good, fair, and poor according to this. Page 9, lines 193-195: This is the only study with posterior instability cases which is different form anterior instability and you should remove this study. DISCUSSION You should compare your findings and compare your results with similar studies (in other sports contact and non-contact sports) to see if there are any differences. ABSTRACT Please report in the Abstract data like, mean Coleman score, rate of recurrence, time to return to rugby e.t.c TITLE Title should be modified to “surgical intervention for anterior shoulder instability.” REFERENCES The references are well organized and appropriately utilized TABLES Tables are OK



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 16369

Title: Surgical interventions for shoulder instability in rugby players: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 00505366

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-01-18 12:52

Date reviewed: 2015-01-18 14:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	PubMed 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 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 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 manuscript is a well organized and written. Although information is not quite new it well summarizes important data for a very specific patient population. This may attract readers' attention. It also gives very good information about the methodology that can inspire many researchers. This Reviewer has no specific comments.