

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85725

**Title:** Comparative study in vivo of the osseointegration of 3D-printed and plasma-coated titanium implants

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03999237

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MS

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-06-13 14:17

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-06-23 13:19

**Review time:** 9 Days and 23 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<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
<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 statements</b>	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

Well done study    Good methodology    well described    Analysis and results explained  
wll    one comment    please describe if uniform contact    area was ensured for both  
implants at insertion and    checked at harvesting    Please do give details regarding  
number of osteoblasts/    comparison of osteoblastic    activity around both implants  
specifically if available    Kindly include any other paramaters - surface    roughness  
parameters    that were compared    please include this reference as well  
Understanding the Role of Surface Modification of Randomized Trabecular Titanium  
Structures in Bone Tissue Regeneration: An Experimental Study. Canciani E, Ragone V,  
Biffi CA, Valenza F, D'Ambrosi R, Olimpo M, Cristofalo A, Galliera E, Dellavia C.  
Medicina (Kaunas). 2022 Feb 18;58(2):315. doi: 10.3390/medicina58020315. PMID:  
35208638 Free PMC article

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 85725

**Title:** Comparative study in vivo of the osseointegration of 3D-printed and plasma-coated titanium implants

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03067229

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** DSc

**Professional title:** Research Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2023-05-12

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-07-10 07:27

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-07-17 06:15

**Review time:** 6 Days and 22 Hours

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

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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

The adequacy of the statistical method used is questionable (Non-parametric tests are more applicable to such a sample). Accordingly, the conclusions of the study may be erroneous. Perhaps the results should be recalculated.