

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 74553

Title: Clinical and mechanical outcomes in isolated ACL reconstruction versus additional lateral extra-articular tenodesis or anterolateral ligament reconstruction

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02691269

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: United Kingdom

Manuscript submission date: 2021-12-27

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-03 13:20

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-05 12:46

Review time: 1 Day and 23 Hours

Scientific quality	☐ Grade A: Excellent ☐ Grade B: Very good ☒ Grade C: Good ☐ Grade D: Fair ☐ Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	☐ 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) ☐ Minor revision ☒ Major revision ☐ Rejection

Re-review	[☒] Yes [☐] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [☒] Anonymous [☐] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [☐] Yes [☒] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract Results No results that compare the rotational instability of two different techniques are given here. Make clear which structure's re-rupture is mentioned here. Is it LET/ALL or ACL? Introduction Well-written Materials and Methods The part in the Results section that explains the selection of studies which include pivot-shift test and IKDC scores should be moved to the Methods section. Results Make clear which structure's re-rupture is mentioned here. Is it LET/ALL or ACL? A comparison of the rotational stability of two techniques could have been made regarding each single stability test used by the studies included. Study Characteristics Given the fact that studies with follow-up times less than 24 months are no longer accepted by major journals, such studies could have been excluded. This would provide a more reliable conclusion. Discussion OK Conclusion It is stated in th Results section that AEAP's did not provide any advantage regarding IKDC scores, but in the Conclusion section it is mentioned that AEAP's provide better functional results. Which one is true, and where is the digital data that supports the conclusion?