PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 66333

Title: Regional anesthesia for orthopedic procedures: what orthopedic surgeons need to know.

Provenance and peer review: Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 04047744

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Associate Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Germany

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2021-03-25

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-03-25 14:17

Reviewer performed review: 2021-03-25 19:10

Review time: 4 Hours

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This excellent manuscript gives a good overview on the topic of regional anesthesia for orthopedic procedures. I presents all relevant techniques for the different orthopedic surgeries. The topic is of high interest, as the techniques described are very commonly used. Most complications that can arise by the regional anesthesia are described. This work will be of high interest to your readers. All conclusions drawn are comprehensible. The linguistic style is very good making the manuscript easy to read and understand. In summary, I strongly recommend publication. One set of complications is however not included: this is CNS toxicity after regional anesthesia. This should be added to increase the awareness of the readers for this very important issue. I.e. a recent publication describes three patients and gives a good comprehension on the topic: Spitzer, Daniel et al. "Local Anesthetic-Induced Central Nervous System Toxicity during Interscalene Brachial Plexus Block: A Case Series Study of Three Patients." Journal of Clinical Medicine vol. 10,5 1013. 2 Mar. 2021, doi:10.3390/jcm10051013

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This article reviews the progress of local anesthesia, each part needs to add personal views and opinions, and points out the follow-up research hotspots and controversies in the summary.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[Y] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [ ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[Y] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

| statements | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All issues brought forward are solved. This manuscript is an excellent contribution to the scientific literature. I strongly advocate publication, no further changes are necessary.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It can be accepted in this style