

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 72070

**Title:** Lateral epicondylitis: new trends and challenges in treatment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05936182

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-10-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-10-09 05:08

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-10-09 05:21

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 Grade E: Do not publish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 checked="" 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</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Firstly, thank you for opportunity to review very interested article. 1. The title reflect the main subject about treatment of lateral epicondylitis, title was clear and easy to understand. The authors used words "new trends and challenges" make reader interesting. 2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. 3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. 4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. The authors explain LE in the terms of definition, history, and epidemiology in introduction sector. 5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, the main objective of this review was to described treatment of LE including surgical and non-surgical methods. I think this article was clear of details 6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study. 7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. 8. The manuscript meet the requirements of publication. 10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 72070

**Title:** Lateral epicondylitis: new trends and challenges in treatment

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05448835

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** BSc, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-10-02

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-11-03 11:50

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-11-03 12:05

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<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 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 checked="" 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</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Write the contribution of your paper at the rest of the introduction using bullet point.
2. Write the background of the work and add some recent references. Authors should add the following paper as references:
  - (i) <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352914820300290> (ii)
  - (ii) <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11045-020-00756-7> (iii)
  - (iii) <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0259179> (iv)
  - (iv) <https://www.eurekaselect.com/194736/article> (v)
  - (v) <https://content.iospress.com/articles/international-journal-of-hybrid-intelligent-systems/his210008> (vi)
  - (vi) <https://online-journals.org/index.php/i-joe/article/view/20009>
3. Future scope and limitations should be included.