

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Orthopaedic Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJORR_104969
Title of the Manuscript:	Comparison of Cruciate-Sacrificing vs Posterior-Stabilized Total Knee Replacement- A Retrospective study
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajorr.com/index.php/AJORR/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community?</p> <p>(Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<p>No, As authors know that ““Most previous studies have failed to reveal any noteworthy disparity in functional outcomes, range of motion, kinematics, and survival rates between CR and PS TKAs”.</p> <p>The authors aim was to “there is a need to investigate the influencing factors regarding the conversion to a PS-type prosthesis in cases where preoperative plans initially involved the use of a CR-type prosthesis”.</p> <p>However, the paper discusses the “compare various clinical and functional parameters using the Knee Society Score”. The disparity in thought needs clarification.</p> <p>Title is appropriate.</p> <p>The abstract is comprehensive</p> <p>The subsections and structure of manuscript are appropriate.</p> <p>The manuscript appears very superfluous without any new findings to suggest for and very inadequate detailing of methodology, results and poor construction of discussion.</p> <p>The references are fine.</p> <p>No exclusion criteria have been identified.</p> <p>No comments on inclusion criteria for CR versus PS knees has been presented in material and methods.</p> <p>A vague statement is presented “Statistical analyses were performed”. Kindly clarify and give more details.</p> <p>The results section shows result at 1 year follow up however, the abstract conveyed a 2 year follow up. Why the disparity?</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Gaurav Govil
Department, University & Country	Max Super Specialty Hospital, India