

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 89243

Title: Meta-analysis of factors influencing anterior knee pain after total knee arthroplasty

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05866874

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Physiotherapist, Professor, Senior Lecturer

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Spain

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-30 08:18

Reviewer performed review: 2023-11-30 08:37

Review time: 1 Hour

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation</li> </ul>



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [ ] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear authors: First of all, I would like to congratulate you on the great research work carried out. It seems to me to be a successful topic and a very well carried out meta-analysis with all the necessary methodological aspects. The results are very well presented and detailed by variables studied. Regarding the introduction, I must say that it is very basic and the first lines do not have references, so I invite you to add to this first section of the text. As for the discussion of the manuscript, it seems to me a section that could be subject to significant improvement, as there are numerous articles with similar themes and should be related to the existing bibliography. Furthermore, in this section they should introduce the limitations of their study. Finally, I suggest a standardised flow chart for this type of study and not one of your own elaboration. Modify these small sections and you will improve the study. Regards



# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 89243

**Title:** Meta-analysis of factors influencing anterior knee pain after total knee arthroplasty

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05059442

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, MS

Professional title: Attending Doctor, Doctor, Researcher, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Malaysia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-25

Reviewer chosen by: Yu-Lu Chen

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-11-30 06:21

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-04 04:49

**Review time:** 3 Days and 22 Hours

	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[Y] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<ul> <li>[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair</li> <li>[ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation</li> </ul>



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [ Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<ul> <li>[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)</li> <li>[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection</li> </ul>
Re-review	[ ]Yes [Y]No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

### SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a manuscript of meta-analysis detailing the effect of certain arthroplasty procedure on post operative anterior knee pain. The title should be further elaborated as this manuscript only look at few of the factors (patella resurfacing, circumpatellar denervation, fixed or mobile bearing implant, lateral retinacular release, freehand or guided cut) while other factors were not discussed here for example quadriceps elasticity, patella position pre and post op and etc. The conclusion need to be elaborated as the results are found from statistical analysis. Majority of the conclusions have been known in previous studies. The statistical analysis is good however the authors need to explain why such tests is done and how is the findings of this manuscript different from the others.