

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Clinical Cases

**Manuscript NO:** 50926

**Title:** Comparison of intra-articular injection of parecoxib vs oral administration of celecoxib for the clinical efficacy in the treatment of early knee osteoarthritis

**Reviewer's code:** 00505361

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor, Lecturer, Staff Physician, Surgeon

**Reviewer's country:** Thailand

**Author's country:** China

**Reviewer chosen by:** Artificial Intelligence Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2019-09-30 09:03

**Reviewer performed review:** 2019-10-01 03:56

**Review time:** 18 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear editor This manuscript compared the results of different regimens with IA parecoxib in early OA patients in a retrospective fashion. I have a number of criticisms as follow; ### Major points 1. Due to the limitation of study design ( retrospective study), both selection bias and evaluation bias cannot be avoid. It should be emphasized in the limitation of the study. 2. Ethical concern; since this study is retrospective evaluation, how the investigator did inform consent ? and how to avoid undue influence from the doctor? 3.Introduction part should contain information regarding pharmacokinetic of IA parecoxib and possible adverse event from IA injection including long term cartilage damage. 4.Statistical analysis: ANOVA should be used instead of t test for multiple comparison and sample size calculation should be calculated. ### Minor points 1.Title should be changed " the comparison of ..." 2.Abstract: regimen of IA Parecoxib and timing of evaluation should be included. 3 Demographic data should included potential confounders; BMI,educational level,marital status,occupation and underlying disease 4.Reference:Ref number,4,5,6,7,10,12,15,17,18,19 should be rechecked for format and style.

## INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

### *Google Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

### *BPG Search:*

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-223-8242  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

[ ] Plagiarism

[ Y ] No