

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 69114

**Title:** Treatment of Knee Osteochondritis Dissecans with Autologous Tendon Transplantation: Clinical and Radiological Results

**Reviewer's code:** 04023880

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Doctor, Senior Lecturer

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-21 18:56

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-22 07:34

**Review time:** 12 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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 Editor, Thank you very much for allowing me to be a Reviewer of the original paper entitled: „Treatment of Knee Osteochondritis Dissecans with Autologous Tendon Transplantation: Clinical and Radiological Results” The problems presented in this paper are quite common and the solution of this issue is really novel. The introduction is well written and clear. The methods section, I have some concerns, because authors should in the beginning of the paragraph clearly state that this was a retrospective study. The Bioethical Committee approval is for a retrospective study and was obtained in 2021. According to data, this is retrospective study and you cannot state in the text that patients were followed-up prospectively. You should add information about the arthroscope, the MRI device. You should also add information about the Bioethics Committee number across the manuscript. Some minor concerns: 1. “cylindrical cast was applied at 15 degrees knee flexion” Why not orthosis? 2. „Preoperative total KOOS score was  $29.4 \pm 5.5$  (range, 21.4-40.5). KOOS total score was found to be increased to  $81.5 \pm 5.9$  (range, 74.2-92.7). All parameters of the KOOS score improved significantly ( $P < .001$ ). The mean MOCART score was found  $56.2 \pm 10.7$  at last follow-up. Patients with less than 4 cm<sup>2</sup> lesion had statistically significantly better overall KOOS ( $p < 0.01$ ) than patients whose more than 4 cm<sup>2</sup> lesion.” – please, delete these results from the discussion section or you can describe this without numbers. Discussion: 1. Regarding the paragraph about the tendons unique abilities and features, here you can use a paper (PMID: 29131279) which described the tendon special functions (“Furthermore, serves as a network for transmission of information; integrins and cytoskeleton transduce mechanical stimuli created by loads and manipulate the tenocytes activity”). 2. “Cartilage evaluation was evaluated with normal MRI.” – what does it mean? 1.5 T? Conclusion: All this paragraph must be extensively edited,

including poor English and major grammar error! References: out of dated, please, put some recent, fresh papers Figure 1 D – are there 2 suture anchors in the subchondral layer? After explaining all of the concerns I’m available for 2nd round of the review. All the best.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 69114

**Title:** Treatment of Knee Osteochondritis Dissecans with Autologous Tendon Transplantation: Clinical and Radiological Results

**Reviewer's code:** 06117173

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-06-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-06-18 05:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-28 07:50

**Review time:** 10 Days and 2 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input 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



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

Dear sir/madam, this study is impressive for its novel technique, results and is very well written, but i would like to suggest a few changes to highlight the essence of this study. Thank you for contributing this study. Thanking you!