BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States
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: 8552
Title: Common controversies in total knee replacement surgery. Current evidence.
Reviewer code: 00364821
Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai
Date sent for review: 2013-12-30 11:39
Date reviewed: 2014-01-11 12:18

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[Y] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[Y] High priority for publication
[Y] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	
[ ] Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade E (Poor)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	[ ] Existed	[ ] Minor revision
		[ ] No records	[ ] Major revision

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Total knee replacement is a widely used operation. However, some technical details are still a matter of a strong debate. The review has tried to extract the best and more up-to-date evidence available regarding some of the most debatable subjects in TKR surgery. The review contents is significant. The title and abstract can accurately reflect the major topic, and the conclusion is valuable. In addition, the review has systematic theoretical analyses.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States
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: 8552
Title: Common controversies in total knee replacement surgery. Current evidence.
Reviewer code: 00732206
Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai
Date sent for review: 2013-12-30 11:39
Date reviewed: 2014-02-12 02:27

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[Y] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[Y] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[ ] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[ ] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[Y] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[ ] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
My only comment is related to the INTRODUCTION section. I would like to see some more details with some reference. For example: a few words and some numbers or statistics about (a) the problem (the knee osteoarthritis), (b) the most common treatment (the TKR), (c) result and complications and finally (d) the common controversies.

BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC
8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, United States
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: 8552
Title: Common controversies in total knee replacement surgery. Current evidence.
Reviewer code: 02444693
Science editor: Huan-Huan Zhai
Date sent for review: 2013-12-30 11:39
Date reviewed: 2014-02-18 19:33

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
[ ] Grade A (Excellent)	[ ] Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	[ ] Accept
[ ] Grade B (Very good)	[ ] Grade B: minor language polishing	[ ] Existed	[ ] High priority for publication
[ ] Grade C (Good)	[Y] Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	[ ] No records	[ ]Rejection
[Y] Grade D (Fair)	[ ] Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	[ ] Minor revision
[ ] Grade E (Poor)		[ ] Existed	[Y] Major revision
		[ ] No records	

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is not a systematic review and the authors should not claim as such. There is minimal detail on searching (far too little) and no structured methods for selection (inclusion criteria), appraisal, extraction or synthesis. In my opinion the authors either need to position the article as a normal lit review or provide more detail on the above steps.