

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 54973

Title: Tibial Tubercle Osteotomy in Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review

Reviewer's code: 05257537

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-28

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-02-29 02:05

Reviewer performed review: 2020-03-03 05:03

Review time: 3 Days and 2 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

This review is a summary of TTO Technology. The quality of the manuscript is ver good.
It's a high quality review.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 54973

Title: Tibial Tubercle Osteotomy in Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review

Reviewer's code: 02488945

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor, Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Greece

Manuscript submission date: 2020-02-28

Reviewer chosen by: Ruo-Yu Ma

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-04-14 04:12

Reviewer performed review: 2020-04-14 11:02

Review time: 6 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article “ Tibial Tubercle Osteotomy in Revision Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review” is well written and worthy of publication with some minor revision albeit a similar review has been published earlier in January 2018 (Archives of orthopaedic and trauma surgery) The following points should be considered for revision: (1) The authors have mentioned has mentioned the cut off dates for the articles for inclusion but not a time period. (2) Coleman methodology score less than 55 should not be included in the review as the authors have mentioned only the mean score of the included studies. Also, one study which was low quality using Modified Delphi technique by Moga should be excluded. (3) The previous similar systematic review in 2018, mentions the complication rates of 3.8 to 20%. So what is different in this analysis that shows the complication rates below 6.5%? (4) The article mentions the pre-operative and postoperative ROM and extension of the knee, but are these the mean values? Some studies in the table do not show pre-operative ROM or extension values, then is that justified to include them for the mean values? (5) Inclusion of Forest plot would definitely be helpful. (6) Page 8 mentions that Non-union is extremely rare. Kindly drop the word “extremely” as the non union rate is close to 2%. Also, mean time for union in infected and non infected knees should be included in the tables. (7) Did TTO help in eradication of infection in RTKA?