

ESPS Peer-review Report

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 9715

Title: Result of the synthetic and the autologous plug for the repair of the donor site area when repairing osteochondral knee defects; a comparative study in a rabbit model

Reviewer code: 00501340

Science editor: Ling-Ling Wen

Date sent for review: 2014-02-26 09:46

Date reviewed: 2014-03-31 03:05

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an excellent study evaluating 2 different methods of repairing the donor site following knee cartilage resurfacing. The authors concluded that the donor site in mosaicplasty technique is better amended with osteochondral autograft rather than with BGS implants. The manuscript is well written and easy to follow. The following corrections are intended for the authors benefit to revise their manuscript: 1. Line 46: Do you mean smooth articular cartilage? 2. Line 67: Please replace "ways" with "methods" 3. Line 76: Please delete "main" 4. Line 80 and 81: Change to 2.5 instead of 2,5. The same should be done in all tables. 5. Lines 92-94: Rephrase or split to 2 sentences 6. Line 96: Please write in full what ICRS is 7. Line 99: What was your hypothesis? 8. Line 111: Why a defect of 4,5 mm x 7 mm was selected? 9. Line 119: Please write in full what BGS represents 10. Lines 158-60: Move your hypothesis to the introduction section 11. Line 163: Change to "Twenty-four weeks after surgery the rabbits..." 12. Line 166: You have already stated your null hypothesis 13. Line 171: put a comma after group A 14. Line 174: put a comma after group B 15. Line 182: Please move this sentence to the methods section 16. Line 191: Change "difference" to "differences" 17. Lines 199-201: Don't summarize your results here. Keep that for the discussion or conclusions section 18. Line 243: What was clearly different from the surrounding cartilage? 19. Line 288: See comment 67