

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 69683

**Title:** Effectiveness of Maitland and Mulligan mobilization methods for adults with knee osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05402068

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, MSc

**Professional title:** Doctor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** United States

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-09 04:23

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-09 04:27

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" 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**

Although less than 10 publications included, I would still recommended to do publication bias assessment. The author can add in the limitation that due to <10 included studies, interpretation of publication bias assessment should be with caution.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 69683

**Title:** Effectiveness of Maitland and Mulligan mobilization methods for adults with knee osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis

**Provenance and peer review:** Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 02566952

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Chief Doctor, Senior Researcher, Surgeon

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-07-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ze-Mao Gong

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-07-26 07:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-07-26 07:56

**Review time:** 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

<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

To authors A well written good conceived manuscript focusing on bringing a higher level of evidence regarding the efficiency of a form of manual physio therapy for OA management

**Comments** In the abstract, the sub chapter aim could be reformulated for increased clarity and understanding while the Methods subchapter needs to be shortened, it is extensively revealed within the manuscript

**Introduction** chapter is well written. Here it seems the aims of the work were to compare the two methods, this is not obvious nor from the title or from the abstract? Was the review meant to perform a metaanalysis on overall efficiency of the methods or to compare the two? Please specify and try to be consistent (title, abstract and introduction-wise). There is a large difference between the number of papers screened and the ones included within the study, how do the authors explain this difference?

**In the discussion** chapter the phrase starting with By bombarding the nervous system, reads speculative. This should be, at least mentioned since no evidence exist to support the statement. The reference cited by authors makes this (speculative) supposition regarding another procedure (electric periosteal dry needling compared to physical exercise and manual therapy. Why do the authors think there is a need to compare the two methods of manual therapy since their effect and indications are somehow distinct? Would it not have been better to identify a specific feature for which one of the two works better (say, ROM, pain, improvement in ADL) ? Do the authors think this study help physiotherapists and/or orthopedist to recommend one or the other of therapies? As the authors state themselves manual therapy is...well, manual, it involves the action of a person onto another human being. Many biases can be found within this interaction of which the KOA causes,

patient fitness, age, sex, compliance to therapy as well as physiotherapist experience and skills. Can we, based on this report modify the way we employ one of the other form of manual therapy or is this just another report? It is difficult from this report to understand why the authors conclude that Mulligan mobilization has “potential” in improving QOL for knee OA patients compared to Maitland.