

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 88689

Title: Analysis of the causes of primary revision after unicompartmental knee arthroplasty: A case series

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05059442

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MS

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Researcher, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-05

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-23 03:55

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-04 03:25

Review time: 11 Days and 23 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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 checked="" 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

Thank you for allowing me to review this manuscript. This is a good case series detailing the causes of revision of UKA in 13 patients. The title is appropriate for this paper. I find this paper to be important as it does a good job in letting the readers understand the various possible complications of UKA and how to manage them. 1. I find that it would be beneficial if the author could let the readers know how many UKA was performed during these time frame and these complications constituted how many percentage of all patients operated by the centre. This could also help other surgeons to counsel and be aware with the possibility of such complications. 2. The authors should also note the outcome of the revisions after each revision method. A good scoring system or objective findings should be described post op to let the readers know the final result of the revision.