



## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82241

**Title:** Meniscus tears treatment: the good, the bad and the ugly. Patterns classification and practical guide

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05334059

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-12 13:36

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-12-12 16:19

**Review time:** 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



**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

<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**

Thank you for allowing me to review your article, author. The article being shown is named "Treatment for meniscus tears: the good, the bad, and the ugly. Classification of patterns and an application guide" explained the new Meniscal Injury Classification. I understand the significance of meniscal function and how to choose a treatment plan. This review is well-organized and structured. One issue needs to be addressed, though. The Classification helps us to understand relationships and connections between things better. They also allow scientists to communicate clearly with each other, be the guide for the treatment, and tell the prognosis. The Classification must be reliable, precise, and account for the majority of the injury pattern. This classification has a few flaws in it, in my opinion. - The distinction between bad and ugly conditions is still beyond my comprehension. The ramp lesion and medial meniscus root conditions you mentioned could be bad and ugly. If the medial meniscus root tear is treated promptly, the prognosis may be favorable. What does this classification's major purpose? Is this a treatment guide, a method of communication, or a prognostic statement? - Before choosing a method of treatment, there are still a number of other factors to consider. It is difficult to suggest a course of treatment based just on the tear pattern. I advise removing out the suggested treatment and substituting with the treatment results. -

Some injuries, such as unstable longitudinal tears, stable ramp lesions, stable LMPR lesions, large flap tears, and others, still do not fall into all of the categories. While this work helps expand the published studies, it needs more clarification and needs to cover more injury patterns.



**PEER-REVIEW REPORT**

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

**Manuscript NO:** 82241

**Title:** Meniscus tears treatment: the good, the bad and the ugly. Patterns classification and practical guide

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer’s code:** 06422289

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer’s Country/Territory:** China

**Author’s Country/Territory:** Italy

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-11

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-12-27 12:10

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-01-04 14:37

**Review time:** 8 Days and 2 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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
<b>Novelty of 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 novelty
<b>Creativity or innovation of 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	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**

The important/innovative of the manuscript: 1. A new classification method is proposed in the manuscript. The classification includes anatomy, characteristics of tears, and treatment comprehensively, so it is helpful for clinicians. 2. The manuscript is well, concisely, coherently organized, and presented. Contents should be improved: In general, the manuscript covers a wide range but lacks of deep discussions. Some parts are not comprehensive enough. For example, the manuscript described vertical longitudinal tear and horizontal tear in detail, but need to add more and further discussion about complex tears, such as bucket handle tears and oblique tear.