

**Re: Manuscript reference No. [76528]**

Dear Editor

Thank you for arranging a timely review for our manuscript. Your comments and the reviewer were highly insightful and enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments of the reviewer.

Revisions in the text are shown using red for additions so that they may be easily identified. In accordance with your suggestion, we change the article according to suggestions. We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses will be sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in World Journal of Clinical Cases.

We shall look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Zhong ren Zheng

Email: 17853736746@163.com

Corresponding author:

Name: Long fei Ma

E-mail: [doctormlf@yeah.net](mailto:doctormlf@yeah.net)

**1 Title.** *The title reflects the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript*

**Response:** We appreciate your positive evaluation of our work.

**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*

**Response:**

We deeply appreciate your suggestion. According to your comment, we have revised the text to address your concerns and hope that it is now clearer. Please see page 1 of the revised manuscript, lines 28.

*Line 33: - Apler test. I think you mean Apley's test, same in line 95*

**Response:**

Thank you for your critical comments and we totally agree with your suggestions which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript. We apologize for the language problems in the original manuscript. Following the suggestion, we have carefully checked and re-wrote the manuscript for spelling errors and language problems. We've changed "Apler test" to "Apley's test" (page 2, line 35 and page 4, line 94).

**3 Keywords.** *Sufficient and reflect the focus of the manuscript*

**Response:** We appreciate your positive evaluation of our work.

**4 Background.**

*Line 71: - I suggest changing the word "under arthroscopy" by arthroscopically or by arthroscopy*

**Response:**

This is an excellent review, we agree with the comment and We've changed "under arthroscopy" to "by arthroscopy" (page 3, line 74).

*Line 70-77: carries repeated data, I suggest summarizing it*

**Response:**

Thank you for your critical comments and we totally agree with your

suggestions which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript.

According to your comment, we have revised the text to address your concerns and hope that it is now clearer. Please see page 3 of the revised manuscript, lines 72-75.

*The introduction didn't show us how rare is this case in the literature.*

**Response:**

Thank you for your sincere comment about this issue. Accordingly, we have added the information in the revised manuscript. Please see page 3 of the revised manuscript, lines 66-68.

## **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?*

**Response:**

This is constructive and insightful comment. According to your comment, we have revised the text to address your concerns and hope that it is now clearer. (page 4, lines100-110; pages13-14, Figure 2 、 Figure 3)

Line 121 I think here it is better to express menisci reformation by saucerization as it is commonly described in the literature

**Response:**

Thanks for your professional suggestion. we agree with the comment and We've changed “menisci reformation” to “by saucerization” (page5, lines124-125).

## **6DISCUSSION**

Discussion Generally is relatively long but covers the literature very well

*Line 143 Please replace “medial disc meniscus” with Discoid medial meniscus*

**Response:**

Thank you for your critical comments and we totally agree with your suggestions which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript. We apologize for the language problems in the original manuscript.

**Following the suggestion, we have carefully checked and re-wrote the manuscript for spelling errors and language problems. We've changed "medial disc meniscus" to "discoid medial meniscus" (page 6, line 145).**

*Line 183 "Murphy test," I think the authors mean McMurray's test*

**Response:**

**We've changed "Murphy test" to "McMurray's test" (page 7, line 201).**

*Line 188-189 "fracture, 3 cases of barrel-handle tear, 1 case of transverse fracture," you mean 10 cases of lamellar tears, 3 cases of Bucket-handle tear, 1 case of horizontal tear.*

**Response:**

**We've changed "fracture, 3 cases of barrel-handle tear, 1 case of transverse fracture" to "10 cases of lamellar tears, 3 cases of Bucket-handle tear, 1 case of horizontal tear" (page 8, lines 205-206).**

*I suggest adding a paragraph the classification of the discoid meniscus, and whether the medial meniscus is classified as the lateral one or has a different classification?*

**Response:**

**This is constructive and insightful comment. Accordingly, we have added the information in the revised manuscript. Please see page 7 of the revised manuscript, lines 176-192.**

## **7 FIGURES**

*Arthroscopic figures after saucerization and partial meniscectomy have to be added to the manuscript*

**Response:**

**Thank you for your critical comments, and we totally agree with your suggestion which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript. We apologize for the figures after saucerization and partial meniscectomy. This is one of limitations of this case, The arthroscopic camera technology of this institution cannot take back screenshots, and can only take snapshots for a short time. At that time, the intraoperative pictures could not be saved in time. Therefore, we are unable to provide figures after saucerization and partial meniscectomy now, and we apologize for the inconvenience to the reviewers'**

work.

***Responses to the comments of Reviewer#2      Reviewer's code: 05937294***

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>*

**Response:**

**Thanks for your insightful suggestion. In the manuscript Discussion section, we have talked more about discoid meniscus, the presentation of tear, the difference in management (pages 7-9 lines193-255). According to the requirements of the magazine, the number of words in the background part should not exceed 80 words. So, we have added the information in the discussion. Please see page8 of the revised manuscript, lines 222-224.**

*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.*

**Response:**

**Thank you for your critical comments and we totally agree with your suggestions which might be of great help to improve the quality of our manuscript. We apologize for the language problems in the original manuscript. We've changed "Apler test" to "Apley's test" (page 2, line 35and page4, line 94).**