



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 89229

Title: Is mortality rate after TKA or THA increased in patients with a history of liver transplant with respect to those who have not experienced previous liver transplant?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 01560549

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Singapore

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-24

Reviewer chosen by: Huo Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-27 04:02

Reviewer performed review: 2023-12-27 04:11

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 Grade E: Do not publish
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



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: office@baishideng.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

Scientific significance of the conclusion in 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 scientific significance
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	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

I think the editorial is fair in its comments on the article by Ahmed but these comments should have been given to the authors of the original paper so that they can comment on the difference between their study and the previous ones.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 89229

Title: Is mortality rate after TKA or THA increased in patients with a history of liver transplant with respect to those who have not experienced previous liver transplant?

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02539765

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MBBS, MD

Professional title: Additional Professor, Teacher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: Spain

Manuscript submission date: 2023-10-24

Reviewer chosen by: Huo Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-12-25 09:27

Reviewer performed review: 2024-01-02 13:45

Review time: 8 Days and 4 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
Novelty of this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" 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

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" 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
Peer-reviewer statements	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

First of all, this article appears to be a “letter to the editor” rather than an “editorial.” Although topic is interesting, the writing is very sketchy and does not meet the expected standards of a scientific journal. The English language is poor and requires substantial improvement. Sentences lack clarity in many places, which disrupts the reading flow. I suggest longer sentences can be broken up into smaller sentences to express the point more clearly. For example, the sentence “However, these authors have neglected to mention and include in their list of references four important articles on the subject that which confirm their findings with respect to outcomes but at the same time contradict their conclusion with respect to mortality” can be split into shorter sentences in order to make it clear.