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: 22020
Title: Use of clinical movement screening tests to predict injury in sport
Reviewer's code: 00501335
Reviewer's country: Germany
Science editor: Shui Qiu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 10:13
Date reviewed: 2015-08-29 00:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] 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	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Very nice work

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: 22020
Title: Use of clinical movement screening tests to predict injury in sport
Reviewer's code: 00505402
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Shui Qiu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 10:13
Date reviewed: 2015-09-22 04:42

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[Y] Accept
[Y] 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	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	[ ] Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		[ ] The same title	
		[ ] Duplicate publication	
		[ ] Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript is ready for publication.

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: 22020
Title: Use of clinical movement screening tests to predict injury in sport
Reviewer's code: 00467045
Reviewer's country: Australia
Science editor: Shui Qiu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 10:13
Date reviewed: 2015-09-22 15:16

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 authors have conducted a comprehensive and well-researched review of different tests which can be used for injury prediction in sport. There are nearly 100 references and tabulated data to support the discussion. The main problem I find with this paper is that there are no images or photographs to show the configuration of the tests or the test being performed, and for that reason, I found it difficult to visualise some of the tests. For example, with the SERB Test, it is described as the subject reaching in eight directions whilst standing on one leg, and then later, there are strips of tape on the floor in a grid format and the 'subject reaches as far as possible in one reach direction.' For someone who is not already familiar with these tests (the general orthopaedic readership of WJO), it is difficult to visualise exactly how the test is performed. Therefore, I think that images or photos of the tests are needed. There are also some sections which are unclear, mainly in the first half of the paper, as outlined below. 1. Abstract (p 1-2): The phrase 'this editorial' is mentioned three times and sounds a bit repetitive. The authors may want to change one of these to 'this study' or similar. 2. Introduction, p 3: The authors have defined overuse and acute injury; however, the definitions in reference they cited are not general definitions but are the definitions used in that specific study. I

question the use of 'identifiable mechanisms of injury' in the overuse injury definition. For example, in the case of stress fractures, many of the mechanisms are known. I would have said an acute injury is from a single specific traumatic event while an overuse injury is from a repetitive force over a period of time. Can the authors please comment on this? 3.Introduction p 3: The authors should consider explaining non-contact injury better here e.g. an injury not resulting from an externally applied force? An injury from inertial forces or muscular pull? Also, I suggest removing 'may involve rotational force' as it may also involve acceleration (TBI) e.g. TBI and may also be linear as well as rotational. 4. Introduction, p 3: In relation to the sentence 'Pre-season movement screening tests…' do the authors mean less effective in predicting contact than non-contact injuries? I'm not sure how the external mechanism in contact injuries makes the screening tests less effective. 5. Functional movement screen, p 4: The sentence commencing with 'The FMS is purported…' I think needs to be reworded. What is fundamental movement and what is a clearing test? 6. Functional movement screen, p 5: The sentence 'The benefits of the FMS…' appears to be unfinished. 7. Functional movement screen, p 6: Please insert 'for example' in the brackets where 'n=34 for females 50-54 years old.' 8. Functional movement screen, p 6: Does Table 2 on p 3574 refer to Reference 14? Can the authors please make this clearer? 9. Functional movement screen, p 7: I'm not sure what the authors are saying with the comment on the deep squat versus the other six movement patterns. Do they mean the deep squat has content validity while the other six patterns do not? Why are the biomechanics of the other six patterns unknown? 10. Functional movement screen, p 7: The phrase 'the lower of the 2 sides is used, and all patterns are equally weighed' is unclear. 11. Functional movement screen, p 8: It would be helpful to have a brief sentence explaining the implication of the lack of unitary construct. Also, the phrase 'above 14 or 14 or less' is not clear. 12. Functional movement screen, p 9: Please write ROC in full when first used. 13. Functional movement screen, p 11: Can the authors please make clear if they mean the study on the American football players or their own paper in the sentence on 'this review'? 14. Y Balance Test, p 11, last line: The word 'shows' might be more appropriate than 'suggests'. 15. Drop jump screening test, p 19: The definition of

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: 22020
Title: Use of clinical movement screening tests to predict injury in sport
Reviewer's code: 01220036
Reviewer's country: United States
Science editor: Shui Qiu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 10:13
Date reviewed: 2015-09-23 03:55

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A: Excellent	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B: Very good	[Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	[ ] The same title	[ ] High priority for publication
[Y] 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

accepted after minor language changes

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: 22020
Title: Use of clinical movement screening tests to predict injury in sport
Reviewer's code: 00736909
Reviewer's country: Israel
Science editor: Shui Qiu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 10:13
Date reviewed: 2015-09-24 19:17

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a comprehensive review of 6 tests that supposedly predict injury in various groups of trainees. It inevitably becomes a large document (51 pages in Word) which makes it somewhat cumbersome. It seems to have been submitted as an editorial, but as I stated, it is a review in its own merit, and it is up to the editors to decide whether and how it might be incorporated in the journal, including whether it should be shortened or broken into 2 or 3 or after addressing my further comments possibly 6. In spite of the fact that there is a core tip, the abstract, in my opinion should summarize the data including conclusions, and not just describe what the review does. The core tip is not concise, and in fact does not really justify reading so many pages. While I am not in a position to know or to check every source they quote, I quite agree with the authors' conclusions that much is lacking regarding the use of these tests. In fact I think it would benefit the reader to have a diagram of the basic concept of these tests: 1) find a test that predicts injury 2) find a way to intervene based on the prediction (by performing some intervention on subjects at risk or by preventing them from participating) & 3) prove that using the test and intervention is effective. If you don't pass 3, you really haven't done anything. Regarding 3) I don't think the authors have stated enough yet. I think

the review could benefit from a simple diagram relating to each of the 6 tests. I think there is literature out there that actually disproves some of the tests, e.g. Kodesh E et al. in Journal of Sports Science and Medicine (2015) 14: 515. I know this submission probably preceded the quotation I present, but there may be more studies disproving the predictive effect. There is not enough discussion on specific injuries, mechanisms & multiple variable models. While it makes sense that measures of ankle instability should predict sprains, why should other measures predict an overall injury incidence? And if ankle instability predicts future sprain, how is it related to previous sprain, and should the history not be at least as important as the measurement. Should each test be related to the specific epidemiology of the subject it is used to predict injury on? Further discussion should relate to the overall statistics of injury prediction and prevention. To what extent do the authors believe injury prediction is possible? What percentage of the variance in injury can be accounted for by history, and measurable factors? And of the measurable factors, what fraction is modifiable? This would throw some light on whether it really does make any sense to continue this endless search for predictors. I also think that more stress should be put on to what extent each one of the tests is proprietary, in that like FMS, people have to use their equipment and pay for training. Beyond the above, I think the manuscript is written well in good English. There are a few typos, nothing that can't be corrected.

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: 22020
Title: Use of clinical movement screening tests to predict injury in sport
Reviewer's code: 00364821
Reviewer's country: China
Science editor: Shui Qiu
Date sent for review: 2015-08-11 10:13
Date reviewed: 2015-10-04 21:39

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

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It's a interesting and practical resche in linical works. But it is an expensive toll. Both SEBT and YBT, which is the best option, still unclear.