PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 74227

Title: Evidence Analysis on the Utilization of Platelet-rich Plasma as an adjuvant in the repair of Rotator Cuff Tears – Systematic Overview of Overlapping Meta-analyses

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04643921

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-18

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-12-18 13:44

Reviewer performed review: 2021-12-30 17:44

Review time: 12 Days and 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

"Evidence Analysis on the Utilization of Platelet-rich Plasma as an adjuvant in the repair of Rotator Cuff Tears – Systematic Overview of Overlapping Meta-analyses" The review is clear and well-written. The applied methodology is appropriate.   My comments are as follows: 1. The authors should briefly explain what is PRP in the introduction and that there are different methods used for their preparation that could explain also different results obtained. 2. In the introduction the authors reported "The reported failure rates of rotator cuff repairs vary between 29 and 94%" citing references 1-4. Did the authors mean that the percentage of re-tears is between 29-94%? Authors should consider that there are several repair techniques that are used to treat rotator cuff tears, and the rate of re-tears varies greatly between studies. There are studies where few patients (<29%) displayed a re-tears.   3. It is unclear why the authors did not include "scopus" as electronic database. 4. In the results the authors reported that 12 were excluded. However, the authors excluded 13 papers starting from 33 and included 20 meta-analysis. The author should check and correct also the supplementary file, where it is reported that 11 studies were excluded.   5. Table 1: the number of the included studies in the meta analysis of Liu et al, 2020 is missing.   6. A lot of important information is reported in table 7 related to the 5 objectives of the study but this table is scarcely described in the results.   7. The authors reported in the results of the abstract that "The initial size of the tear and type of repair performed do not seem to affect the benefit of PRPs. Among the different preparations used, leucocyte poor (LP)-PRP possibly offers the greatest benefit as a biological augment in these situations.". However, this part is not fully elucidated in the results.   8. There are different types of

rotator cuff tears. It is likely that the effects of PRP could be different in the presence of partial and complete rotator cuff tears or isolated tears and combined rotator cuff tears involvement. This point should be better discussed. 9. In the discussion there is no mention about the different arthroscopic surgery techniques that are used to repair rotator cuff tears. It is likely that the use of a specific arthroscopic surgery technique in combination with PRP gives a better result compared to another. This point should be discussed.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Please reassess Meta-analysis quality with the QUOROM systems. 2. Please only include Level I meta-analyses in the overlapping meta-analyses.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript titled by"Evidence Analysis on the Utilization of Platelet-rich Plasma as an adjuvant in the repair of Rotator Cuff Tears" was done by Muthu S et al, but need some revisions. The   database should be update, the figure should be improved,especially Fig.3.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Meta-Analysis*

Manuscript NO: 74227

Title: Evidence Analysis on the Utilization of Platelet-rich Plasma as an adjuvant in the repair of Rotator Cuff Tears – Systematic Overview of Overlapping Meta-analyses

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05468112

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: India

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-18

Reviewer chosen by: Xin Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-02-24 13:20

Reviewer performed review: 2022-03-07 02:30

Review time: 10 Days and 13 Hours

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In the manuscript entitled "Evidence Analysis on the Utilization of Platelet-rich Plasma as an adjuvant in the repair of Rotator Cuff Tears – Systematic Overview of Overlapping Meta-analyses", the authors performed an overview on the overlapping meta-analyses that analyzed autologous platelet-rich plasma (PRP) as an adjuvant in the repair of rotator cuff tears. My comments are as follows: 1. The standard description of the included and excluded literatures in this systematic review is not very detailed, the sample size of the included literatures is too small, and the quality of the included literatures is not high enough, so the conclusions drawn are questionable; 2. The heterogeneity of the included literature was not further analyzed in this study; 3. This study focuses more on the description and summary of the original literature, but there is less analysis of the research data involved in the included literature, and insufficient systematic review research methods are applied to this systematic review; 4. The literature types included in this study are few and the search strategies are not comprehensive enough; 5. This study included few outcome indicators and failed to make a detailed analysis of the surgical effects before and after the use of PRP in the surgical repair for rotator cuff tear.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [Y] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [Y] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript has been written on a poorly designed study. Furthermore, the scope of this manuscript is not aligned with the scope of this journal. This manuscript is not suitable for publication in its present form.