

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 83887

Title: Chondroitin sulfate and glucosamine combination in patients with knee and hip osteoarthritis: a long-term observational study in Russia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05731995

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: BSc, MSc, PhD, RN

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United Arab Emirates

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-07 20:59

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-07 21:42

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="radio"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="radio"/> Grade B: Good <input type="radio"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="radio"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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
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

This is a very interesting prospective cohort study aiming to investigate the impact of GA+CS on clinical outcomes of patients with knee and hip OA and patients treatment satisfaction. The study has a unique approach of addressing the effectiveness of the treatment and patients satisfaction at the same time. I have few comments to improve the quality of the manuscript for publication. I believe the authors should address these comments before publications.

- The result in the abstract is descriptive. However, the main results reported some important and statistically significant outcomes with P-value 0.001. I believe that the P-values should be reported in the abstract to highlight the robustness of the outcome.
- The introduction reported good epidemiological background of the problem. Taking into consideration that this study is also concerned with patients' satisfaction, I believe that the introduction should have a paragraph discussing this issue. There is a couple of recent studies reporting that patients preference for OA treatment is driven by patients' desire to avoid treatment side effects, I believe this evidence will strengthen the argument of encouraging the use of GA+CS instead of NSAIDs and they should be used in the introduction: Al-Omari B, McMeekin



**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>

P, Bate A. Systematic Review of Studies Using Conjoint Analysis Techniques to Investigate Patients' Preferences Regarding Osteoarthritis Treatment. Patient Prefer Adherence. 2021 Feb 3;15:197-211. doi: 10.2147/PPA.S287322. PMID: 33568897; PMCID: PMC7868222, and Al-Omari B, McMeekin P. Patients' Preferences Regarding Osteoarthritis Medications: An Adaptive Choice-Based Conjoint Analysis Study. Patient Prefer Adherence. 2020 Dec 22;14:2501-2515. doi: 10.2147/PPA.S283922. PMID: 33376311; PMCID: PMC7765685. •The student's paired t-test was used. However, there is no mention of the hypothesis being tested. The author must report the hypothesis of the study and based on the t-test if they are accepting or rejecting the null-hypothesis. I believe this has already been done, just need to be reported. •The methods and results sections are reported very well. •The discussion of the patient's satisfaction in the discussion section is very short. I believe this is one of the main novelties of this study and the discussion should be expanded and included some references such as NICE guidelines 2022 which encourages the inclusion of patients satisfaction and preferences in OA treatment: <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng226>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 83887

Title: Chondroitin sulfate and glucosamine combination in patients with knee and hip osteoarthritis: a long-term observational study in Russia

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05395420

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: DNB, MS

Professional title: Assistant Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Russia

Manuscript submission date: 2023-03-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-03-13 12:47

Reviewer performed review: 2023-03-13 13:06

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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
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 type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear Authors Congratulations on the study. I have some concerns that need clarification before considering the presented manuscript for publication. 1. The study includes patients from KL 1-3 grades but gives the conclusion that it is useful for very early stages of disease but failed to give the details of the stages of the patients included 2. A subgroup analysis of the outcomes based on the stage of the disease could be made to identify the effectiveness of the treatment with each stage of the disease 3. the recommended duration of the treatment is not mentioned to ascertain the compliance rate for the specified treatment