



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 79981

Title: Taper-wedge stem suitable for anterior approach total hip arthroplasty: Adequate biomechanical reconstruction parameters and excellent clinical outcome at mid-term follow-up

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03071706

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Taiwan

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-13

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-16 10:41

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-16 10:49

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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



Re-review	[<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>] Yes [<input type="checkbox"/>] No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

Major comments: 1) In these two UCB-MNCs-related clinical trial study (Morteza, et al. 2022; Limin, et al. 2019), they tested efficacy and safety of umbilical cord mesenchymal stem cell therapy as well and efficacy and safety were assessed at least 12 months. On the other review article that published by Jaydeep (Jaydeep, et al, 2022) pointed out the follow-up should be extended to more than 2 years of this treatment in future study. Based on these previous studies, therefore, the follow-up in this clinical trial was less than one year and it might not enough period of time to demonstrate the therapy is viable and safe. Please clarify it. 2) Although there were no control group in this study, authors should compare the efficacy of UCB-MSCs with other forms of treatment for knee OA at least. Otherwise, it is difficult to identify the efficacy. Please clarify it. 3) In discussion section, authors talked about the issue of UCB-MSCs injections interval of one month and allogeneic cells cannot survive in the host joint for a long time, and allogeneic bone marrow MSCs can survive for up to four weeks after intra-articular injection. However, UCB-MSCs had been reported that have high proliferation, did authors checked UCB-MSCs viability and effectiveness between two injection intervals, especially the injection numbers of cell were higher? Minor comments 1) There were no references cited on the paragraph “UCB-MNCs were directly isolated from umbilical cord blood with low immunogenicity, non-invasive acquisition, and amplification without in vitro culture.” of page 3. Please add the references. 2) The last paragraph in introduction, “in particular, it has not been reported in the treatment of KOA. The purpose of this study was to investigate the efficacy and safety of human UCB-MNCs in



**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

the treatment of KOA". Please clarify the latest information of the researches.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 79981

Title: Taper-wedge stem suitable for anterior approach total hip arthroplasty: Adequate biomechanical reconstruction parameters and excellent clinical outcome at mid-term follow-up

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06296786

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Italy

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-13

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-10-21 02:33

Reviewer performed review: 2022-10-21 03:04

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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



**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

Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

This is a retrospective study focusing on Anterior approach for total hip arthroplasty. Overall, this is a repeating research which focuses on the complications and compares the results with previous studies. To better illustrate the points proposed by the paper, I suggest two issues to be added. First, please make correlation analysis to figure out potential risk factors for the poor outcome, based on the Table 1. Second, this is a study with long time period. Are there more than one senior surgeons conducting the procedures? Please clarify this and, when necessary, add related analysis, description and discussion.