Baishideng Publishing Group

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 66732

Title: Alignment of the hindfoot following total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05625711

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MM

Professional title: Attending Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-22 13:07

Reviewer performed review: 2021-04-25 13:48

Review time: 3 Days

Scientific quality	[　] Grade A: Excellent　　[Y] Grade B: Very good　　[　] Grade C: Good [　] Grade D: Fair　　[　] Grade E: Do not publish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)　　[Y] Accept (General priority) [　] 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

Although the quality of the articles, met the inclusion criteria, were not as good as I expected, the statistical analysis in this study did well. Only in the discussion section, I have a suggestion. In page 10, line 209-211, interestingly, Cho et al reported improvement in hindfoot alignment 3 weeks post TKA but little to no improvement at 2 years postoperatively, suggesting that compensatory changes in hindfoot alignment predominantly occur during the early postoperative period. As the change of biomechanics in lower limbs is a complex process, which is one of the reasons why there are so few RCTs in this subject, there should be more discussion in the end of this paragraph.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 66732

Title: Alignment of the hindfoot following total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review

Reviewer's code: 05536554

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Academic Research, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Argentina

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-04-04

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-04-20 00:51

Reviewer performed review: 2021-05-02 18:54

Review time: 12 Days and 18 Hours

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: Alignment of the hindfoot following total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review

General Comments: Overall, this is some interesting paper that has merits. However, there are some questions that remain about the study and I consider that some minor revision is needed.   1. Abstract: The abstract is of appropriate length and summarizes the study well.   Line 26: could you clearly specify the purpose? Foot and Ankle clinical outcomes.   2. Introduction: appropriate   Line 82: Also clarify what clinical outcomes evaluated are you evaluating.   3. Methods: appropriate   Line 108-109: Incomplete. Please explain all data evaluated.   Line 109: Reoperations are not evaluated in the results.

4.   An appropriate statistical analysis is performed   5.Results: appropriate   Line 120: I believe "Clinical trials" is not the best way to describe the articles included. Line 164, 168, 174 and 176: Please explain the magnitude of the improvement.   6.

Discussion: The discussion is well written.   7. Conclussion: appropiate   8.

TITLE Title is appropriate for the study.   9.   Tables and Figures: Figure 1. Please explain the reasons for excluding those 2160 articles.   10. References: References are in correct order and correct format.