Reviewer’s report

Title: Radiological changes do not influence clinical mid-term outcome in stemless humeral head replacements with hollow screw fixation: A prospective radiological and clinical evaluation

Version: 0 Date: 18 Oct 2017

Reviewer: Carlo Biz

Reviewer's report:

Revision

Many thanks to the authors for having presented this paper about the interesting topic of shoulder replacement. Unfortunately, it has some deficiencies that, from my point of view, require the following major revisions before being suitable for publication in an international journal, such as Musculoskeletal disorders. Background

The abstract is well structured and precise, containing the main results of the study. Methods

This section contains enough information to understand and possibly repeat the study. However, it contains several results that should move in Results section. Further, only Constant score was performed to patients' evaluation. Why did not other scores or SF-be used for clinical assessment? This is an important limitation of the study that should be reported in the discussion like a weakness. Ex: "A total of 95 eligible patients with 100 stemless humeral head implants were included in the implants) were lost to follow-up or had missing data. Clinical and radiological data of 73 shoulders (1 patient bilateral) were prospectively collected before, two years (short follow-up) and at least 48 months (mid-term follow-up) after surgery, or until indicated revision surgery". I suggest the authors accurately read the Strobe Statement-Checklist for cohort studies before revising their manuscript.

Results

The results presented are complete and adequate.

Discussion

The length and content of the discussion communicates the main information of the paper. However, the results are discussed more with arthroplasty papers rather than anatomical shoulder replacement. Please add few papers reporting anatomical shoulder replacement experiences and quote for reverse shoulder arthroplasty: Treatment of proximal humeral fractures with reverse shoulder arthroplasty in elderly patients. Iacobellis C, Berizzi A, Biz C, Camporese A. Musculoskelet Surg. 2015 Apr;99(1):39-44. doi: 10.1007/s12306-014-0331-2. Epub 2014 Jun 11.

Conclusion

The conclusions only reflect and refer to the results of the study.

Tables and Figures

The number and quality of tables and figures are appropriate to transmit the main information of the paper. However, legends and tables should move at the end of the paper and be presented in a better way, with more space between the results to appear clearer.
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