



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
ESPS manuscript NO: 17192
Title: Minimally invasive knee arthroplasty: An overview
Reviewer’s code: 02444730
Reviewer’s country: Greece
Science editor: Yue-Li Tian
Date sent for review: 2015-03-02 19:18
Date reviewed: 2015-05-06 19:35

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> 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

In my opinion this review is very well presented and is very informative particularly for the young orthopaedic surgeons. My only comment is the absent of the results or the benefit of these different procedures. I believe that a brief report of the results/benefits according to the existing literature is needed.



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 17192

Title: Minimally invasive knee arthroplasty: An overview

Reviewer's code: 03069301

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-03-02 19:18

Date reviewed: 2015-05-07 17:44

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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 authors present a review and update paper on Minimally Invasive Knee Arthroplasty. The paper looks interesting, is very clear, and not too long. I wonder if it is more suitable as an editorial. That is in editor's hands.



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

ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS manuscript NO: 17192

Title: Minimally invasive knee arthroplasty: An overview

Reviewer's code: 03070691

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Yue-Li Tian

Date sent for review: 2015-03-02 19:18

Date reviewed: 2015-05-05 17:58

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	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"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
		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

The authors are commended on their efforts to review the literature on an important research topic such as minimally invasive knee arthroplasty. This manuscript has some potential but it needs to be significantly re-formatted and re-written to be considered. This draft manuscript is not thorough and it is in need of significant revision prior to being suitable for publication in the journal. After reading the corpus, the authors may begin with editing the title. As written, the body of the paper doesn't reflect the high expectations set forth by the title. Leaving the title, as is, necessarily contrasts the content of the paper as being underwhelming. The major thing that is unusual about this review article is it that at the beginning it looks more like the evolution of UKA and TKA rather than minimally invasive surgery. The authors are describing anesthetic techniques, pain medications and length of stay whereas this research should more rigorously follow its aim. Is it a review and update on minimally invasive knee arthroplasty? It is not clear if it is a review, a description of surgical approaches or what. Moreover, literature search is weak and it looks more like an editorial with many authors' opinions expressed in the text rather than a review article. Furthermore, this review article doesn't seem structured appropriately. Probably, it would have been better having a section



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>

for approaches, one for instruments, and one for associated changes such as anesthetic techniques, rehabilitation, etc. The way the manuscript is presented now is too confused. Other Specific Concerns: Line 62, Page 3, "Unicondylar Knee Arthroplasty-": The acronym "UKA" has already been used and this section should be entitled as "UKA". Line 63, Page, 3: I think that UKA's history is more than Repicci's modified surgical approach. It looks like the authors are playing down the importance of this kind of surgical procedure. Moreover, why the authors are talking only about Repicci? What about before Repicci (Insall J, Aglietti P (December 1980). "A five to seven-year follow-up of unicondylararthroplasty". J Bone Joint SurgAm62 (8): 1329-37.;Insall J, Walker P (October 1976). "Unicondylarekneereplacement". Clin.Orthop. Relat. Res. (120): 83-5.)?. Line 67, Page 3, "Figure 1": Figure 1 does not adequately show the extent of the incision. A new more precise image beore the skin has been incised should be selected. Actually, most of figures are not adequately describing the approaches. Probably it would have been better having a drawing for each of them. Line 80, Page 4: Techniques or surgical approaches? It is quite unclear the exact aim of this study. Is it a review? Is it an update of new surgical procedures/approaches? There is substantial difference between technique and approach! Line 146, Page 7, "Surgical Procedure Summary": It looks more like an "algorithm" for patient selection more than a surgical procedure summary. It could be very useful but the title should be modified accordingly. Line 150, Page 7, "BMI": The acronym is here used for the first time and it should have been fully explained before. Line 187, Page 7, "The true answer was obviously in the middle.": It should be erased. It is not appropriate for a scientific paper.