



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 20220

Title: Recent advances and future directions in the management of knee osteoarthritis: Can biologic joint reconstruction replace joint arthroplasty and when?

Reviewer’s code: 03068027

Reviewer’s country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-01 15:36

Date reviewed: 2015-07-16 04:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting editorial about a topic of orthopaedics that will probably present important developments in the future. Although the argument is covered satisfactory in terms of different models I would suggest further explanation on some of these. On page 3 the paragraph on “Kinematic aligned total knee replacement” should have an explanation of what this method involves and the same for the “Robotic technology in Orthopedics”, “Navigation in TKR”, “Biologic Growth Factors” and “Tissue engineering and regenerative medicine applications”. Furthermore some minor language and grammatical polishing i.e: 1. page 4: paragraph on “Robotic technology in Orthopedics” is not properly aligned 2. page 6: effectiveness instead of ffectiveness. Finally in my opinion the questions: “How feasible is to claim today that biologic joint reconstruction will soon replace artificial joint arthroplasty?” “How soon these changes can be constituted in clinical practice?” should be modified accordingly to the manuscript conclusions. Probably the second question is premature.

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 20220

Title: Recent advances and future directions in the management of knee osteoarthritis: Can biologic joint reconstruction replace joint arthroplasty and when?

Reviewer's code: 03402256

Reviewer's country: United Kingdom

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-01 15:36

Date reviewed: 2015-06-17 17:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The author gives a succinct description of the recent advances in the field of osteoarthritis management. He presents details on the potential of the different modes of assisted surgery on offer today, and describes the recent advancements on the different modes of biologic joint reconstruction. This is a very interesting topic and it has been covered well, even though briefly. **MAJOR POINTS** This is an editorial that starts with the premise to provide a current and concise evidence to address the question of whether and when biologic joint reconstruction could replace joint arthroplasty. The author sets out by replacing this question with two new ones: How feasible is to claim today that biologic joint reconstruction will soon replace artificial joint arthroplasty? how soon can it be constituted in clinical practise. Firstly, question 2 is irrelevant if question 1 is negated. Secondly, the question is I think premature. The evidence we have so far and that the author presents in this editorial shows that there is not enough evidence to show long term efficacy of biological joint reconstruction. Therefore, I think the author needs to readdress the title and the main question of his editorial, perhaps to the one that he answered in the conclusions. B. Page 5, last paragraph, lines 7-9:



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

MSCs exhibit a relatively safe profile, please explain safe in what respect? C. Page 6, paragraph 3, line 8 limitations that “cell homing” process has. They need to be stated briefly. MINOR POINTS There are also a number of grammatical errors that we pinpoint below: Page 3, line 6: has initiated.. change to: has been initiated... Page 4, paragraph 2, line 5: ...its use have been... change to: its use has been... Page 4, last line: ...;lacks or vessels... change to: ...lacks vessels... Page 6-7, More interestingly,over the last years. Please rewrite this sentence as it very badly written. Page 7, first paragraph last line: change “favors” to “favor”. Page 7, paragraph 2, line 4: change “One of the most ...” to “Two of the most...”. Page 7, paragraph 2, line 9: change “The use osteochondral...” to “The use of osteochondral...” Page 7, paragraph 3, line 4: change “...reconstruction to replace...” to “...reconstruction replacing...” Page 8, paragraph 2, line 2: change “...prior joint replacement...” to “...prior to joint replacement...”



ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 20220

Title: Recent advances and future directions in the management of knee osteoarthritis: Can biologic joint reconstruction replace joint arthroplasty and when?

Reviewer’s code: 02990457

Reviewer’s country: Italy

Science editor: Xue-Mei Gong

Date sent for review: 2015-06-01 15:36

Date reviewed: 2015-07-01 16:16

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I congratulate with the author for the succinct but well focused work on biologic treatment of knee OA. The manuscript is ok and quite ready for publication. However I would highlight and expand some topics to let the reader understand more extensively some concept that could be not usual. First, it seems that all the manuscript is focused on knee, therefore I would rephrase the title accordingly and revise the conclusions. Secondly, I would expand and briefly explain the concept of KA, as the the navigation\robotic (how it works, which are the advantages on conventional TKA?) Third, which are the stimuli for cell homing Fourth, i would also mention meniscal sustitution (allograft and prosthese) as could be considered a strategy to prevent OA or avoid metal resurfacing. You can refer to the following paper in this regard: "Unicompartmental osteoarthritis: an integrated biomechanical and biological approach as alternative to metal resurfacing. Marcacci M, Zaffagnini S, Kon E, Marcheggiani Muccioli GM, Di Martino A, Di Matteo B, Bonanzinga T, Iacono F, Filardo G. Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc. 2013 Nov;21(11):2509-17." Lastly, I would present the results of each technique in a deep way: how are the improvement? pain reduction? increased survivorship?



BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

radiographic\MRI results? Conclusions: ok References: ok