PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 77564

Title: Patient reported dissatisfaction following second side in staged bilateral total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer’s code: 02694731

Position: Editorial Board

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Doctor, Senior Lecturer, Surgeon

Reviewer’s Country/Territory: Switzerland

Author’s Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-05-06

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-07-04 10:31

Reviewer performed review: 2022-07-04 15:31

Review time: 4 Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Excellent</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Very good</th>
<th>[ ] Grade C: Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Fair</td>
<td>[ ] Grade E: Do not publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language quality</th>
<th>[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing</th>
<th>[ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing</td>
<td>[ ] Grade D: Rejection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion</th>
<th>[ ] Accept (High priority)</th>
<th>[ ] Accept (General priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Minor revision</td>
<td>[ ] Major revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Re-review          | [ ] Yes                      | [ ] No                       |


SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear Authors, this paper report solid based information, that should be enclosed in the preoperative information for patients before the second TKA. I recommend to accept this manuscript for publication.
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Dear authors: Thank you for carrying out this research work. The following will give you several options to improve your manuscript:  
- For reviews, a systematic review registration must be carried out in PROSPERO, just like a clinical trial. Please proceed with the registration and reflect this in the manuscript. You should make clear the inclusion and exclusion criteria for articles in this review. You should also assess the reliability of the selected articles using some kind of scale (PEDro or similar...).
- The introduction to your manuscript is very sparse and there are hardly any references. In addition, you should include current data.
- The results section should include a table in which the articles studied by variables, sample, results and conclusion are shared, so it would be more graphic.
Please improve these sections, best regards.