

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**Manuscript NO:** 54689

**Title:** High tibial osteotomy and umbilical-cord mesenchymal stem cells for knee cartilage regeneration

**Reviewer's code:** 02566952

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Senior Researcher, Surgeon

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Romania

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-06 08:02

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-06 08:51

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

A well written manuscript describing a good designed clinical study investigating the role of HTO associated with stem cell therapy on the progress of OA knee joints. Comments Abstract Due to the retrospective nature of the study, was it not possible to perform a control study comparing the procedure with HTO without stem cells instillation? The role of MSCs in this mixture is not clear due to the absence of a control. Moreover the procedure for MSc implantation strongly reminds of microfracture. Is the implanted cell population responsible for the outcome or mere the good old subchondral bone stimulation? A control group in this respect would have been useful and etichaly feasible since microfracture is a well established procedure. What is the author opinion on the fact an open surgery is needed for implanting stem cells? Could this be technically developed to avoid such open knee surgery for stem cell implantation? What kind of stem cells are included in the CARTISTEM? expanded or not expanded? There is a difference between fresh isolated MSCs and in vitro expanded stem cells. The authors are commenting regarding the dose dependent effect of stem cells in cartilage repair and about number of implanted cells relatively to defect size? Was the MSC dosing similar for all patients ? or a priori dose calculation has been made

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Stem Cells

**Manuscript NO:** 54689

**Title:** High tibial osteotomy and umbilical-cord mesenchymal stem cells for knee cartilage regeneration

**Reviewer's code:** 02728252

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Egypt

**Author's Country/Territory:** South Korea

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-02-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Le Zhang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-03-05 07:25

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-03-07 12:38

**Review time:** 2 Days and 5 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

In the title, the type of the study should be added. I have a sense of confliction; whether the study is retrospective observational or it is an interventional one. Where is the patient consent, a statement about that should be added to the methodology section? A chart with demographic data for the patients will add a value for the study.