



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: 17355

Title: Simple elbow dislocations: Management, direct medical cost and clinical outcome

Reviewer's code: 02705522

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-03 20:39

Date reviewed: 2015-03-26 21:53

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 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"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very well done and useful study, which contributes to existing literature on this subject and clearly tells us that an unnecessary and prolonged immobilization is not only harmful to the patient but the hospital economics, as well!



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: 17355

Title: Simple elbow dislocations: Management, direct medical cost and clinical outcome

Reviewer's code: 02592398

Reviewer's country: India

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-03 20:39

Date reviewed: 2015-03-26 22:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> [] 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 type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> [] Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> [Y] 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 type="checkbox"/> [Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

excellent paper,



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
ESPS manuscript NO: 17355
Title: Simple elbow dislocations: Management, direct medical cost and clinical outcome
Reviewer's code: 03065857
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong
Date sent for review: 2015-03-03 20:39
Date reviewed: 2015-03-27 08:06

Table with 4 columns: CLASSIFICATION, LANGUAGE EVALUATION, SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT, CONCLUSION. It contains checkboxes for various review criteria like 'Grade A: Excellent', 'Priority publishing', 'Google Search', etc.

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract: Methods: I'm not sure I would consider a 100 degree arc of motion a satisfactory outcome. Yes, there have been studies which show that about 100 degrees of necessary for most ADLs, but I don't know if I would consider an elbow which was normal to start with, and then had only 100 degrees of ROM satisfactory. Obviously too late to change this now, but would mention the following study regarding functional ROM of the elbow: J Bone Joint Surg Am. 2011 Mar 2;93(5):471-7. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.I.01633. Functional elbow range of motion for contemporary tasks. Sardelli M1, Tashjian RZ, MacWilliams BA. Conclusion: I would reword this to emphasize the 3 week LOI following simple elbow dislocations Core tip: based on the results of your study, it seems like 3 weeks if the cutoff, not 2-3 weeks. Intro: Any comments on pronation/supination needed for ADLs? Did you look at this? Needs a hypothesis at the end of the intro Please include a picture of a simple elbow dislocation and a complex Methods: Lost the date and approval number for the IRB approval Define inadequate follow up Results: 33 fractures? What kind of fractures? Elaborate on the sport related injuries (what sport, mechanism, etc) Elaborate on how all of the dislocations were treated Do you feel you can reliably evaluate post-op ROM if Group 3 didn't come to their therapy



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>

appointments? Don't you think this kind of discrepancy would significantly effect the results? - certainly this is a limitation Any comment on why some of the patients had CT, MRI, etc? Discussion: Please add in info about the sports related injuries in your patient cohort in the discussion section about sport injuries Agree with the cost difference explanation Why would I expect the medical costs to be higher in the prolonged immobilization group? Conclusion: Conclusion in the paper should match the conclusion in the abstract

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 17355

Title: Simple elbow dislocations: Management, direct medical cost and clinical outcome

Reviewer's code: 02705621

Reviewer's country: Japan

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-03-03 20:39

Date reviewed: 2015-03-30 04:34

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		BPG Search:	<input checked="" 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 is a nice retrospective study that focused on the clinical outcome after the reduction of simple elbow dislocation. However, there were several drawbacks mainly in the study design. Please consider following comments and questions. 1. P7, L4: What was the "small avulsion fractures"? Please define the inclusion criteria more precisely. 2. P7, L17: It seemed that the patients who did not come to the original date of appointment constituted Group 3. Did the authors confirm that those patients really continue the immobilization for more than 3 weeks? Did they really follow the treatment program? 3. P9, L2: The number of significant figures should be the same throughout the manuscript. 4. P9, L10: In 8 patients (10%), no x-rays were taken before the reduction. These patients might better be excluded from the study group. 5. P10, L11: ...used was in Group ... Probably, "I" was missing in this sentence. 6. P13, L1: ...two patient in... should be ...two patients in... 7. Discussion: The limitations of the present study should be described in the discussion. 8. Table 3: The title of this table should be reconsidered.