PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

Comments to the Author Title: Changes in the Trends of Orthopedic Services Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Review This Mini-Review attempted to address Changes in the Trends of Orthopedic Services Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic by searching published papers in the PubMed database from 2019 to 2021.   Authors, thank you for taking the time to write such a good review on this interesting title; nevertheless, there are a few concerns that need to be addressed: • As you stated, "The PubMed database was searched for relevant studies…." Why do authors search for only the PubMed database since different relevant publications might occur in other reputed databases like Scopus, Web of Science, and others for related work? • The review article should provide a comprehensive foundation on a topic and must explain the current state of knowledge. In this regard, the authors did their best and highlighted the main methodologies and research techniques in existing works, however, it is not clearly shown the gaps identified in existing studies for potential future research. This should be specified. • Sometimes review article may draw new conclusions from the existing data, is there any new conclusions drawn? • The authors tried to present a critical discussion in the review but need to be elaborated more including implications. •   Check for abbreviations/acronyms that should be defined for the first time and used consistently. 1. Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2. Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript?   Yes 3. Keywords. Do the keywords reflect the focus of the manuscript?   Yes 4. Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study?   Yes 5. Methods.

Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6. Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes 7. Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? Yes 8. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Yes 9. Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes 10. Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 11. References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12. . Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Yes 13. Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate

research methods and reporting? Yes 14. Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? Yes

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 76920

Title: Changes in trends of orthopedic services due to the COVID-19 pandemic: A review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05536533

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MS, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Assistant Professor, Research Associate

Reviewer's Country/Territory: India

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-04-06

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-21 02:41

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-21 03:31

Review time: 1 Hour

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

No new information is being discussed   The authors have summarized the findings in each and every study.   Discussion is inadequate   No word is mentioned about author's perspective

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

Dear Authors: . Below are my recommendations for improving the work: - Firstly, your bibliographic search is limited only to the English language and in principle it can be a bias in your research. You should justify why you only accept this language. In the same line they propose to exclude studies dealing with vertebral alterations, why? - They should include a score on the relevance of these studies in the table of studies analysed. They can carry out an evaluation according to the PEDro scale, for example. - You should also register this systematic review in PROSPERO. - They should also make the choice of manuscripts clearer and more concise by making a sub-section on material and methods in which the inclusion and exclusion criteria are included in a more detailed way.   Best regards.