

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 81970

**Title:** Cost-effectiveness of patient specific vs conventional instrumentation for total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis

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

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 03999237

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MS

**Professional title:** Professor

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-12-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Geng-Long Liu

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2023-03-07 14:32

**Reviewer performed review:** 2023-03-19 11:28

**Review time:** 11 Days and 20 Hours

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 Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No creativity or innovation

<b>Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
<b>Language quality</b>	<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
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<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

Good article comparing costs and outcome the costs of the instrumentation and the sterilization have been compared. would be clear in a detailed table with the individual parameters as well as total cost. analysis and the discussion have been well structured the references could be updated to include more recent references Comparative Study Int Orthop. 2017 Jul;41(7):1361-1367. doi: 10.1007/s00264-016-3356-3. Epub 2016 Dec 19. Patient specific instrumentation versus conventional knee arthroplasty: comparative study Vlad Predescu 1, Catalin Prescura 2, Razvan Olaru 2, Liliana Savin 3, Paul Botez 4, Bogdan Deleanu 5 Affiliations expand PMID: 27995304 DOI: 10.1007/s00264-016-3356-3 Patient specific guides for total knee arthroplasty are ready for primetime. Schotanus MG, Boonen B, Kort NP. World J Orthop. 2016 Jan 18;7(1):61-8. doi: 10.5312/wjo.v7.i1.61. eCollection 2016 Jan 18. PMID: 2680735 There are 2 more studies from 2022 however they are after January 2022 when the 2nd literature search was done for this article. Overall the article is well written good concept and the cost comparison has been well done