



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8488

Title: Current concept in dysplastic hip arthroplasty; operative techniques for acetabular and femoral reconstruction

Reviewer code: 01218364

Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai

Date sent for review: 2013-12-29 15:02

Date reviewed: 2013-12-31 21:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

A well written and thorough article, more suitable as a book chapter on CDH. Little new information but an interesting read. A few minor typographical errors and illustrations that could be improved.



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8488

Title: Current concept in dysplastic hip arthroplasty; operative techniques for acetabular and femoral reconstruction

Reviewer code: 02699658

Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai

Date sent for review: 2013-12-29 15:02

Date reviewed: 2014-02-15 00:31

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input 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"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y]Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y]Minor revision
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y]Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I would suggest to provide a review article including a detailed method section, which describes your data analysis. Afterwards you should provide a comparison of the different treatments.



ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8488

Title: Current concept in dysplastic hip arthroplasty; operative techniques for acetabular and femoral reconstruction

Reviewer code: 02699716

Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai

Date sent for review: 2013-12-29 15:02

Date reviewed: 2014-02-22 01:41

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<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"/> [] No records	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> [] Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> [] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors, according to my opinion, your manuscript is nice to read although it needs several minor revision to be published. Overall, the paper is well written but it needs an English language revision. Introduction is well written Anatomy and classification sections are well written and few remarks should be made: 1. I would add also some sentences about the acetabular retroversion (please refer to CORR 2003;416:245-253 and Clin Orthop Relat Res 2004, 418: 48 - 53 2. I would add the classification described by prof. Ganz about acetabular morphology in DDH I would add a very short section to describe the surgical alternatives to THA in those patients such as periacetabular osteotomies (i.e. you may use Minerva Ortopedica e Traumatologica, vol. 64, p. 41-52, ISSN: 0394-3410 as a reference) In the acetabular reconstruction section you may add some sentences about the indications of trabecular metal in DDH describing pros and contras of this solution. Please avoid the word “new” in the sentence “new method named cotyloplasty”, it has been described several years ago. Please try to be more fair in the description of cotyloplasty technique: risks and complications and not only the advantages should be described. The same should be done for the pre-operative skeletal traction. Please quote the rate of greater trochanter nonunion (you may find an average in the papers used ad references), I think the reader would be interested in that number.... A more balanced description of authors’ technique for lateral approach should be done. Contras and not only pros of the procedure should be presented. Although I personally agree with your opinion, please add a reference or clearly state “according to our opinion” in the sentence “required complex and detailed preoperative planning that was sometimes hard to perform during surgery”. Figures’ legends should be shortened.