

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 19800

### **Response to reviewers and Editorial Office**

We would like to thank the reviewers for their time in reviewing this manuscript and their valuable suggestions. We strongly believe that these suggestions significantly improved the manuscript. All the changes made to the manuscript have been highlighted with Word Track Changes. Detailed response to reviewers follows. In red the authors' responses.

### **Editorial Office**

Line 4. A short running title has been added

Lines 51-61. A Core Tip was added

The audio Core Tip was recorded and attached to the submission

Reference numbers were modified throughout the manuscript (square brackets in superscript).

Lines 354-380. The Comment has been added at the end of the manuscript

### **Reviewer 00458932**

The manuscript is of interest. Few grammatical errors are listed below:

Title: Where are we now

Line 2. This was changed, thank you.

Page 3, line 14:articulated cartilage

Line 88. This was changed, thank you.

Page 4, line 15:scaffold with

Line 118. This was changed, thank you.

Page 6, line 10: alcian blue

Line 168. This was changed, thank you.

Page 6, line 19: Sixteen fully.

Line 177. This was changed, thank you.

Page 6, line 23: In a similar study, Frisbie et al (2009) compared...

Line 181. This was changed, thank you.

Page 8, line 3: glue. A...

Line 211. This was changed, thank you.

Reference list: First author in bold.

Lines 384-463. This was changed throughout the reference list, thank you.

Ref 14, journal name is in bold letters

Line 440. This was changed, thank you.

### **Reviewer 02505493**

The present review aims to investigate the state of the art regarding Cartilage Autograft Implantation System or Particulated Juvenile Allograft Cartilage. The technical part of the work, i.e., searching the literature and selecting the studies to fulfill the criteria defined, looks good. However, the organization of the m/s does not follow the general rules for review articles. Some characteristic examples are as follows: 1. The chronological listing of the various observations, especially in the sections regarding “Basic Science” without any criticism does not help the reader.

The authors understand that this is an unusual way of presenting the results. However, limited papers were included in this review and the authors wanted to describe the results of all articles, in order to give a complete information to the readers. Some criticisms were added to the manuscript, but most of the comments can be found in the discussion section.

2. In some cases the text seems to be written in a “copy-paste” way (i.e., compare page 4, 1st paragraph, and the abstract of ref. 4).

Lines 101-116. This paragraph was changed according to the suggestion, thank you.

3. The same (or very similar) text is written in different cases, i.e., page 4, 1st paragraph (Basic science – in vitro experiments for CAIS) and page 9, 1st paragraph (Basic science – in vitro experiments for PJAC), although the results of different techniques are presented in the different pages.

Lines 237-256. These paragraphs were changed according to the suggestion, thank you.

4. In page 5, last paragraph, the authors refer to a study being “in press” therefore they must correct the way of its presentation.

In fact, Reference 9 is a paper accepted for publication on Arthroscopy journal. The review process is completed and the definitive version of the article has been proof read already. Therefore, the authors feel that this article should be cited in the reference list.

5. There are several typo and syntax errors (i.e., see page 4, line 5 from end “in another study published in 2012...” but the cited work has been published in 2013,

Line 126. This was changed, thank you.

or page 6, line 2 from end “In a similar study published by Frisbie et al in 2009, compared empty defects, CAIS technique.....”),

Line 181. This was changed, thank you.

as well as words not separated by space. All text should be examined “word by word”. Without the above corrections, the m/s is not suitable for publication.

The whole manuscript was examined word by word and the required corrections were made, thank you.