

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Journal of Advances in Medicine and Medical Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JAMMR_129263
Title of the Manuscript:	Biomechanical Assessment of Patients with Unilateral Total Knee Arthroplasty: Preliminary Comparative Study Between Fixed and Rotating Tibial Plateau Prostheses Using the 2-Minute Walk Test (2MWT)
Type of the Article	

General guidelines for the 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 guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is important for the scientific community, especially for orthopaedic surgeons, partially – for physiatrists and physiotherapists. If the study remains (and more patients are investigated), the process of choice of the type of knee prosthesis can be facilitated.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is OK. My suggestion is to introduce the abbreviation 2MWT in the abstract, not in the title.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Yes	
Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.	Yes.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.	The number of references is 20. A total of 16 sources are from the last 10 years, only one source is from the last 5 years. If authors want, they can include some actual sources, for example: Ishii Y, Noguchi H, Sato J, et al. (December 23, 2024) Patient-Centered Discharge and Postoperative Length of Hospital Stay in Primary Total Knee Arthroplasty. <i>Cureus</i> 16(12): e76271. doi:10.7759/cureus.76271 Varacallo M, Luo TD, Mabrouk A, et al. Total Knee Arthroplasty Techniques. [Updated 2024 May 6]. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2024 Jan-. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK499896/ References are not numbered. In some references, 6 or 7 authors are mentioned, in other – only 3 authors et al. It will be better, if the identic style is used in all references. E.g. reference 10 (Dall'Oca) is with 7 authors, reference 13 (Tsubosaka) has 7 authors, but only 3 authors are mentioned (X,X,X et al.) Tsubosaka M, Muratsu H, Nakano N, et al. Sequential changes in lower extremity function after total knee arthroplasty. <i>Journal of Orthopaedic Surgery</i> . 2020;28(3). [the correct issue is 3, not 1, please, make the correction] doi:10.1177/2309499020965645	
Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	Yes, the language is OK.	
Optional/General comments	The article presents the results of an observational comparative study between 2 groups of patients after total knee arthroplasty (TKA) – fixed or rotating prosthesis of the tibial plateau. Authors can explain better the clinical significance of the 2 minutes' walk test and the gait analysis (using the modern equipment of G-sensor of BTS, Italy). A detailed explanation of the studied parameters can be added: different gait phases and sub-phases of support and swing; cadence, velocity, pelvic rotations, etc. – in table 1 and the third paragraph of results analysis. Now, they are not sufficiently clear. You have the data in the device of BTS. The article will be more valuable, if the study can be prolonged with the inclusion of more patients. Maybe in the section 2.1. (Eligibility criteria), the coronary artery disease and the cardiac insufficiency can be mentioned as exclusion criteria. No information about the functional exam of patients, e.g. range of motion of the knee joint after the arthroplasty. No information about the applied rehabilitation protocols in both groups.	

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ivet Koleva
Department, University & Country	Medical University of Sofia, Bulgaria