



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 37801

Title: Why Total Knees Fail

Reviewer’s code: 00505434

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-05

Date reviewed: 2018-01-05

Review time: 13 Hours

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input 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

This is a concise review article that covers an important topic. Manuscript is well written, although format does not fit in with the journal well but it reads very well. I suggest to publish this manuscript in WJO.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 37801

Title: Why Total Knees Fail

Reviewer's code: 02703298

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-05

Date reviewed: 2018-01-18

Review time: 13 Days

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input 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

I have assessed the paper with the name of "Why Total Knees Fail". My opinions are as follows; Title: Main idea is clear and understandable. Abstract: Abstract is readable. Introduction: Previous pertinent literature cited and discussed. Therefore, introduction is adequate. The necessity for the study is clearly indicated. Methods: Study design is appropriate to achieve study aim. Discussion: Discussion is sufficient and informative. References: References are updated and accurate. Also references are relevant and comprehensive.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 37801

Title: Why Total Knees Fail

Reviewer’s code: 03518978

Reviewer’s country: United States

Science editor: Li-Jun Cui

Date sent for review: 2018-01-16

Date reviewed: 2018-01-20

Review time: 3 Days

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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors have summarized the changes of the reasons for failure of total knee arthroplasty historically. It was found that initially, the most common mechanism of TKA failures included aseptic loosening, instability and malalignment. Newer longitudinal studies report that infection has become the primary acute cause of failure with loosening and instability remaining as the overall greatest reasons for revision. Generally this review has provided some useful clinical information. However, there are a few concerns, which need to be clarified: 1. The title should be clearer. Such as “ Why Total Knees Fail - A perspective review” Or “A Perspective Review of the Mechanism of Total Knees Fail”. 2. There are many review papers regarding the reasons or mechanisms of primary total knee arthroplasty failure in the literature. The authors should address what is new in current review. 3. There may be some bias in the selection of the papers. How did the authors control bias? 4. The final conclusion of this review



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501,
Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

(line257-263) did not include detailed information.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
Manuscript NO: 37801
Title: Why Total Knees Fail
Reviewer’s code: 02689304
Reviewer’s country: Afghanistan
Science editor: Li-Jun Cui
Date sent for review: 2018-01-16
Date reviewed: 2018-01-21
Review time: 4 Days

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		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although articles about this issue are numerous, investigation of TKA failure regularly is important and necessary. A number of factors may occur and various degrees of severity may require to be resolved in order. English writing of this manuscript is smooth but some areas are described unclear (including Tables) and require re-checking. e.g. line 88-93; ----etc. Recently, periprosthetic fractures occur with an increased incidence. Some may cause TKA failure. Please comment in Discussion section. The whole concepts are correct. Because the content has numerous repetitions following chronology, reading is boring. The newest concept had better be reported in Conclusion section.