

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4151

**Title:** Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Best Practice - A Review of Graft Choice.

**Reviewer code:** 02444765

**Science editor:** Wen, Ling-Ling

**Date sent for review:** 2013-06-18 14:57

**Date reviewed:** 2013-08-03 23:37

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

GENERAL COMMENTS MAY CONSIST OF FOUR MAJOR POINTS (1) The importance of the research and the significance of the research contents; (2) The novelty and innovation of the research; (3) Presentation and readability of the manuscript; and (4) Ethics of the research. The research concepts are fairly important; however the presentation of the introduction, discussion, comparative studies, and conclusions does not include all the problems of the research. The systematic review concept of best practice in ACL reconstruction is not novel to the literature, of course, there is not enough evidence available in the literature, and so this work may have a place in the literature. The importance of this work would be in reference to the graft choice in ACL reconstruction, however, the description of the clinical studies (results) using different grafts not clarify the problem of graft choice in all specific cases. SPECIFIC COMMENTS MAY CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING POINTS Title: It accurately reflects the major topics and contents of the systematic review. The title describes the work but does not reflect the results. Abstract: The abstract is an adequate representation of the components of the manuscript. It is better written than the manuscript itself. Introduction: There is poor justification of the need for the systematic review. There is minimal discussion of timing for ACL reconstruction and graft choice in competitive athlete who participates in pivoting sports. The introduction does not specify problems concerning the revision ACL surgery and multi-ligament reconstructions. A purpose is stated. Discussion: It is questionable on which grounds did the authors decide on the studies and their results which are represented in graft choice section. Section comparative studies should include some studies with isokinetic measurements at six months and at one or two years follow-up comparing muscles (flexor/ extensor) strength deficit after ACL reconstruction. Conclusions: They are well organized. Valuable conclusions are provided but there is nothing new for the reader. References: Are appropriate, relevant, and updated.