

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 64016

**Title:** Arthroscopic removal as an effective treatment option for intra-articular osteoid osteoma of the knee

**Reviewer's code:** 02566952

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Senior Researcher, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

**Author's Country/Territory:** Croatia

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-02-27

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-03-06 06:49

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-03-06 07:19

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**www.wjgnet.com

## **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

A well written good conceived manuscript presenting results from an interesting case series report on arthroscopic removal of osteoid osteoma of the knee. Below are point by point comments. Comments I would advise on a statement title rather than question-type title of this paper. The authors started from the hypothesis that the procedure is indeed efficient in removing IOO for the knee and have not compared the procedure with classical intervention neither with OO in other locations. This is in the same time a limitation of the paper and should be mentioned as such. In the Introduction chapter the reader is informed the aim of the paper is to offer a literature review but then the methods describe collection of a case series report. There is a discordance between this that should be addressed. Please mention in the objective paragraph the intention to report about a case series as well. Material and methods should read a little more structured (describe in short subchapters the methods for literature review, case series collection, describe the arthroscopic intervention in itself, postoperative management and data interpretation. Has any quantitative instrument for evaluation of pre /postop knee function/pain used? (VAS, IKDC?) What was the topographical location of the iaOO in author's case series as well as in the literature? Were any imaging follow up performed? What was the average dimension of ia OO removed? Did the author feel, at least in some cases, the need for grafting the articular surface defect? Please comment and elaborate on this.