

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8640

Title: Treatment of meniscal tears: an evidence based approach

Reviewer code: 00505427

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-12-31 21:14

Date reviewed: 2014-01-23 02:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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

Well written review article on meniscal tears, the authors reviewed the literature, discussed the pattern of meniscal tears, operative and non operative treatments and proposed a decision tree for meniscal tears.

ESPS Peer-review Report
Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8640

Title: Treatment of meniscal tears: an evidence based approach

Reviewer code: 02459226

Science editor: Wen, Ling-Ling

Date sent for review: 2013-12-31 21:14

Date reviewed: 2014-02-17 05:37

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors performed a review of meniscal tears and tried to describe a treatment algorithm. Unfortunately, their presented manuscript is no systematic review paper but more structured like a book chapter. I am afraid, that it is therefore not suitable for publication in its current form. Please find further comments hereby listed:

Title. Appropriate, please indicate, that this is a review paper

Abstract: Please structure the abstract in "introduction", "methods", "results" and "conclusion".

Paper structure: Please start your work with an introduction on the topic, outlining the controversy and why your review is important. Then describe how you performed the review. What keywords were searched for in what kinds of databases? Did you work according to the PRISMA criteria? You have to bring a systematic approach into this. List your results according to your methods section. Describe, how many papers where found according to your search algorithm and why you excluded which papers. Describe what kind of data you extracted or perform a study per study analysis. Finally, you need to discuss your findings with the background of the literature. I see, that the authors have put a lot of efforts into this, however, the structure of this paper has to be critically revised prior to a possible publication.