



# BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

http://www.wjgnet.com

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32827

**Title:** Systematic review on the use of autologous matrix-induced chondrogenesis for the repair of articular cartilage defects in patients

**Reviewer's code:** 02565607

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-03-24

**Date reviewed:** 2017-03-24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a well designed and written systematic Review study.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32827

**Title:** Systematic review on the use of autologous matrix-induced chondrogenesis for the repair of articular cartilage defects in patients

**Reviewer's code:** 02741591

**Reviewer's country:** Egypt

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-04-13

**Date reviewed:** 2017-04-14

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

### COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The abstract is truncated. ....and the aim of this study is to systematically review these studies. COMMENT: English language needs polishing. COMMENT: The objectives of this review should be unified throughout the abstract and article. The 3 objectives presented at the end of the introduction should be wrapped up in the abstract. The presented results in the abstract are not conclusive and should be presented with more in-depth. Methods: To be more appealing, a flow chart of the study design is suggested with more details than that presented in figure 1. Accordingly, remove repeated text. Results: Avoid redundancy and repeating results mentioned in the tables. The results text should not include references. Only present the results reached for this review. The references could be included in the tables 9as they were compared) otherwise, consider references in the discussion only. It is too lengthy and should be better wrapped up. The conclusion should be more concise and focused. As a review of literature article, it could include up to 60 references. Table 1 should be



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

better designed so that it all comes on one page. Tables need to be self descriptive.