

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 20185

Title: Promising short-term clinical results of the cementless Oxford phase III medial unicondylar knee prosthesis

Reviewer's code: 02897620

Reviewer's country: Australia

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Date sent for review: 2015-06-01 10:09

Date reviewed: 2015-07-28 12:12

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 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 type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input type="checkbox"/> No	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you for the opportunity to review this paper. My comments are as follows: Title and abstract UKP needs to be defined. Abstract: Clear and concise. Introduction: unicondylar knee prosthesis is used in the first line and can be abbreviated at that time in UKP, rather than in the second sentence. Last paragraph of introduction, first sentence "as good as" should be "as well as" Methods section, second paragraph. Were the two patients who were deceased, deceased at follow up? This is not clear. Also did the one patient who refused to participate initially consent and then refused and thus was lost to follow up? Technique section: First sentence, second line "accept the cementless.." should be "except the cementless..." Second sentence, "Additional" should be "Additionally" Second paragraph, last sentence "haemarthros" should be "haemarthrosis" Third paragraph, second sentence "pomp" should be "pump" Fourth sentence, "prophylaxes" should be "prophylaxis" Second last sentence "physical therapy directly." should be "physical therapy immediately". Clinical and radiological evaluation section First paragraph, first sentence "shorter" should be "less" First paragraph, last sentence, "upon 5 degrees specific." should perhaps be "in 5 degree increments" Results: First

paragraph, first line, "Of the patients with an UKP,..". Third sentence "accept" should be "except". Redo's section Sentence 6, I am unclear what "bended osteoma" means. Otherwise results are clearly presented. Discussion: First sentence "want" should be "wanted". Third paragraph, second last sentence "to little bone" should be "too little bone". Last sentence, last word "solved" should be "resolved". Sixth paragraph, second sentence "posterior" should be "posteriorly". Conclusion: Last line "for patients eligible" should be "for eligible patients". Figure 1, does this present mean scores. This should perhaps be stated in the title. It also presents outcomes which have different scales, which makes interpretation a little difficult (eg ROM and VAS scale). Table 1, "sexed" should be "sex". There is a value for "Follow-up" in the table with a p value. This is follow-up of what? It is unclear what the p value is referring to which is aligned to OA medial, OA lateral, OA patellofemoral. Is it joint space difference? If this is the case, some values presented are zero which makes interpretation difficult and the value of the Chi square test questionable.