ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
ESPS manuscript NO: 17023
Title: Predictors of spine deformity progression in adolescent idiopathic scoliosis: A systematic review with meta-analysis
Reviewer's code: 00505431
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-02-08 15:59
Date reviewed: 2015-04-10 00:11

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I enjoyed reading this very rigorous analysis and appreciate the extensive amount of work that was required. The inclusion criteria were rigorous and the analysis quite detailed. 25/1391 references included testifies to the quality of the literature. Background is excellent but a bit long, should tailor introduction to specific study question….what does literature show about risk of progression in AIS. Sometimes risk factors for progression get confused with description of possible etiologies. Page 6, lines 13-14.   The ability to predict which curves would worsen and require active treatment is also of value because those with non-progressive curves could be discharged from followup, saving health care resources. As of now we follow so many of these patients with clinical checks, xrays, etc. Would finish background with a concise statement of the study question…how strong is the evidence for selected risk factors for progression of curves in AIS? The discussion reads like the results section. I would consider summarizing the findings in a manner in which the clinican can appreciate, what can we conclude based on this rigorous analysis…the average reader does not have such an in depth knowledge of the statistics. When such rigorous science is applied to evaluating the evidence we

always need more and better evidence!

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
ESPS manuscript NO: 17023
Title: Predictors of spine deformity progression in adolescent idiopathic scoliosis: A systematic review with meta-analysis
Reviewer's code: 02444825
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-02-08 15:59
Date reviewed: 2015-03-05 06:30

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C: Good	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	[ ] Plagiarism	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is too long.   The study rationale is weak and the potential impact of this manuscript is also lacking.   How the outcomes from this analysis will affect the clinical protocols currently utilized to predict deformity progression in AIS patients?   One of the key analyzing factors missing is the gender.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
ESPS manuscript NO: 17023
Title: Predictors of spine deformity progression in adolescent idiopathic scoliosis: A systematic review with meta-analysis
Reviewer's code: 00646241
Reviewer's country: Germany
Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji
Date sent for review: 2015-02-08 15:59
Date reviewed: 2015-03-25 08:15

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[Y] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[ ] Grade B: Minor language	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for
[ ] Grade C: Good	polishing	[ ] Duplicate publication	publication
[ ] Grade D: Fair	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of	[ ] Plagiarism	[ ] Rejection
[ ] Grade E: Poor	language polishing	[Y] No	[ ] Minor revision
	[ ] Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the paper ?Predictors of Spine Deformity Progression in Adolescent Idiopathic Scoliosis (AIS). A 1 Systematic review with meta-analysis", the authors Noshchenko et al. present a highly interesting and diligently performed, important meta-analysis aiming at the identification of factors predicting progression of scoliosis in idiopathic adolescent cases. The review appearantly includes all relevant studies published in the field, it represents a detailed, open and rigorous analysis, and finally draws conclusions demonstrating all results in the appropriate level of evidence. In my view, it should be published in this journal. The introduction presents a clear overview about the analysed disorder, and gives the basic medical information. The materials and methods section is very clear and well organized also showing potential limitations and biases of the work. In the results section, between a number of very interesting findings, the authors state ?The search revealed no randomized controlled clinical trials meeting the inclusion criteria." This fact of course weakens the strength of the whole meta-analysis and all ist parts, however, it hints to the urgent need of further research work in the field. Further it becomes clear that definitions, parameters and methods used in the community are

extremely heterogeneous in the scoliosis community. The work, however, brings all these data in a very diligent way together. The language is well written. The figures are acceptable, however, fig. 2 contains some relatively small letters, this may be somewhat improved.   Some minor corrections should be added: p.4, line 15 instead of while 22-27% demonstrates better write while 22-27% demonstrate   p.8, line 15 instead of Jeuvenille better write juvenile   p.8, line 17 instead of Scheurmann's better write Scheuermann's