

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 76528

Title: Discoid medial meniscus of both knees: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05937294 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-03-21 06:19

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-21 06:59

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous



Baishideng **Publishing**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA

Telephone: +1-925-399-1568 **E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the authors presented a case of bilateral discoid Medial Meniscus and the manifestation of injury. There are a few issues that should be addressed by the authors before consideration for publication: 1.during the background, you should talk more about discoid meniscus, the presentation of tear, the difference in management. the foregoing article may help you: https://doi.org/10.1002/jum.15955 2.Line 33 and 94 you stated that "Apler" test in positive. Did you mean "Apley" test? I revised the manuscript grammatically using track changes. please find the attached.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 76528

Title: Discoid medial meniscus of both knees: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05446574 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Egypt

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-05-23 14:46

Reviewer performed review: 2022-05-27 01:55

Review time: 3 Days and 11 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA **Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com **https:**//www.wjgnet.com

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Manuscript title Discoid Medial Meniscus of Both Knees: A case report 1 Title. The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript 2 Abstract. the abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript Line 26:- the discoid meniscus is not an anatomical variant, it is a congenital anomaly as written down thankfully in the introduction, please change this phrase Line 33:- Apler test. I think you mean Apley's test, same in line 95 3 Keywords. Sufficient and reflect the focus of 4 Background. Line 71:- I suggest changing the word "under the manuscript arthroscopy" by arthroscopically or by arthroscopy Line 70-77: carries repeated data, I suggest summarizing it The introduction didn't show us how rare is this case in the 5 CASE PRESENTATION The finding of the MRI examination need to be written more precisely with describing how the diagnosis of the discoid meniscus was made? Line 121 I think here it is better to express menisci reformation by saucerization as it is commonly described in the literature 6 Discussion Generally is relatively long but covers the literature very well Line 143 Please replace "medial disc meniscus" with Discoid medial meniscus Line 183 "Murphy test," I think the authors mean Line 188-189 "fracture, 3 cases of barrel-handle tear, 1 case of McMurray's test transverse fracture," you mean 10 cases of lamellar tears, 3 cases of Bucket-handle tear, 1 case of horizontal tear, I suggest adding a paragraph o the classification of the discoid meniscus, and whether the medial meniscus is classified as the lateral one or has a different classification? Arthroscopic figures after saucerization and 7 Figures partial meniscectomy have to be added to the manuscript



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 76528

Title: Discoid medial meniscus of both knees: A case report

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05937294 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Research Fellow

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Iran

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2022-03-20

Reviewer chosen by: Han Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-04 07:42

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-04 07:48

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No



SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

the comments were completely addressed and in my opinion the manuscript is ready to publish