

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 56170

**Title:** Proximal fibular osteotomy- Systematic review on its outcomes

**Reviewer's code:** 03515630

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Professor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** India

**Manuscript submission date:** 2020-04-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Jia-Ping Yan

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2020-05-26 18:04

**Reviewer performed review:** 2020-06-02 11:26

**Review time:** 6 Days and 17 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" 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

Dear authors Thanks a lot for your interesting review of a novel approach for management of knee osteoarthritis. However, I think some real critics exist regarding the structure and contents of this manuscript.

1- It is not obvious that the manuscript is whether a narrative or systematic review. It seems that authors have used a search strategy for finding relevant studies, but they have not mentioned the key-words used and how they reviewed the results and how they excluded non-relevant articles in PRISMA flow diagram. Otherwise, the structure of the manuscript is not so similar to a comprehensive narrative review transferring the authors' experience in this field.

**Response 1:**

Thank you for the review. The manuscript is a systematic review according to PRISMA guidelines, the necessary correction have been made. The key words have been included and PRISMA Algorithm stating the methodology has also been added.

2- As the title shows authors aimed to do review on evidence & technique of fibular osteotomy. However, when reviewing the technical considerations they have only used one published article (Ref No. 6) and this is in contrast with the concept of review and it is not clear what additional value it has over the mentioned reference.

**Response 2:**

Thank you for the review. The authors have taken this question into consideration and modified the article to systematic review on outcomes. As literature is sparse about this very novel technique a review on its technique was not practical. Hence, the authors have described a standard procedure which is being performed.

3- In the results section it has been mentioned that the clinical studies have investigated



**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>

483 knees. In table 1 the total number of cases is 535!

**Response 3:**

Thanks for the review. This was a typographical error and has been modified.

4- The manuscript did not follow a reasonable style to clearly explain the topic for readers.

**Response 4:**

Thanks for the review. The authors have changed the entire style of manuscript for readers to better understand.