

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 76028

**Title:** Outcomes After Arthroscopic Repair of Rotator Cuff Tears in the Setting of Mild to Moderate Glenohumeral Osteoarthritis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 01206157

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-02-27 01:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-02-27 07:33

**Review time:** 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input 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**

Dear Authors I read your manuscript and found to be interesting. However, there are certain flaws in methodology, results interpretation and discussion. It is mentioned in the manuscript attached.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Orthopedics*

**Manuscript NO:** 76028

**Title:** Outcomes After Arthroscopic Repair of Rotator Cuff Tears in the Setting of Mild to Moderate Glenohumeral Osteoarthritis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 06107136

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD

**Professional title:** Doctor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-02-26

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-03-02 16:48

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-03-02 21:26

**Review time:** 4 Hours

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No



7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** bpgoffice@wjgnet.com  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

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

The authors attempt to determine the Outcomes After Arthroscopic Repair of Small to Large Rotator Cuff Tears in the Setting of Mild to Moderate Glenohumeral Osteoarthritis by comparing matched cohorts with and without GHOA. There is a paucity of literature regarding this topic and the 2 largest studies existing are contradictory. Limitations include the small number of patients and the heterogeneity of treatment within the operative group. The group certainly should be followed for mid-term outcome follow up (5yrs).

1 Title. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript.

2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.

Line 6- spelling for similarly

Lines 8-9 - change wording for flow

Lines 11-12 - again, change wording for flow

Introduction - lines 38-42 - The thought process driving this paragraph is understood, but it should be edited for flow

3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.

4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study - see introduction comment above

5 Methods. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail.

Line 91 - Figure 3c not present. Also these seem to be defined by retraction and not in antero-posterior dimension. This should be clarified in the text.

6 Results. The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. The results fall in line with the 2019 study on the topic, but not the 2013 study.

7 Discussion. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion is accurate and discusses the paper's scientific



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
**https://**[www.wjgnet.com](http://www.wjgnet.com)

significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. Lines  
207-209 - How many had follow up longer than 2 years? Why include this comment?  
This could possibly expose a bit a statistical fragility in this study if there are only a  
handful of patients that were followed past 2 years, but 4 of them went on to get an  
arthroplasty (when only 2 total did within the 2 years). Lines  
227-228 - More of a reason not to include the comment on the patients followed up after  
2 years until you have data on all at another future timepoint - say 5 yrs. 8  
Illustrations and tables. The figures, diagrams and tables are sufficient, good quality and  
appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript meets  
the requirements of biostatistics. 10 Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of  
use of SI units. 11 References adequate in number and quality. 12 Quality of  
manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript is well, concisely and  
coherently organized and presented. The style, language and grammar is accurate and  
appropriate. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their  
manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1)  
CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials  
study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3)  
PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis;  
(4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort  
study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. The author prepared the  
manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. 14 Ethics  
statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments,  
author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and  
approved by their local ethical review committee. The manuscript met the requirements  
of ethics.