Editor in Chief
World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology
July 7, 2022
Re: Manuscript NO: 78158

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We are pleased to submit a revision for the manuscript entitled, "Medical malpractice litigation involving otolaryngology residents and fellows: a case-based 30-year review," and we thank you for your comments. We have taken several measures to address these comments and have listed our response below.

COMMENTS:
Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors:
1. Abstract should contain intrdocution/background section to clrify the rationale of the study
   - The requested background section has been added (Lines 48-52). Thank you.
2. Correct the following sentense and verify the year. This collection stores every appellate federal and state case spanning all 50 U.S. states from January 1790 to present day.
   - The year has been verified (Lines 117-118). Thank you.
3. The cases can be also categorised like from 1990-2000, 2001-2010 and 2011-2020 to understand the nature, type and trend of cases.
   - We have amended the first paragraph of the results section to include this decade-based analysis (Lines 156-157). We have also explained this finding in the discussion section (Lines 275-278). Thank you.
4. The median payout can be calculated as per the cases wise to understand the distribution of payout.
   - We have included the median payout calculation for all cases (Lines 189-193). We hope that this adequately addresses your recommendation. Thank you.
5. Whats the current status of the trainee after case, i.e. practising status, licence etc.
   - Unfortunately, this information is not available for most cases. Some jurisdictions labeled legal parties involved with terms such as "anonymous" and/or "confidential," to avoid revealing identifying information.
6. The cases can be any type of error but it can be stretched to the training importance, so that the implementation can be done on particular point. The errors you identified are correct but whether it's related to training or personal skill, needs to be addressed.
   - We agree with this comment. The manuscript has been amended. (Lines 278-280).

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Major revision
Specific Comments to Authors:
The material is interesting and the topic is relevant. The method seems to have been followed faithfully and the authors were well-positioned to conduct the analysis. Despite these positives in my view the paper needs more work before it could be published and I have made some specific suggestions below:

1. The literature addressed is not described accurately so far as I can see. Relevant literature should be presented more deeply in order to support the research problem.

- We agree that a deeper dive into the literature is required to support the research problem. We have conducted a rigorous supplementary literature review to highlight articles of relevance. The outcome of the literature review can be appreciated throughout the introduction and discussion sections. Our reference list now includes >70 citations.

2. Discuss the international relevance of the phenomenon and describe thoroughly the rationale for the study in the context of what is already known. More actual references should be provided.

- We agree that international relevance of the content is of the utmost importance. We have added a new paragraph to address this topic in the context of what is already known (Lines 260-268). Thank you.

3. The discussion section should be reorganized because they are poor. I believe there should be a better integration of the results with the existing literature.

- We agree that there is room for improvement in the discussion. We have reorganized the content and incorporated additional existing literature (Lines 196-284). Thank you.

4. The recommendations for practice/research/education/policy should have been approached in greater depth.

- We agree this critique. Paragraph addressing recommendations have been incorporated to address this area of concern (Lines 242-246 and 255-259). Thank you.

CHECKLIST FOR STYLE The manuscript is clearly written and will serve a broad audience of students, researchers, and practitioners.

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:
(1) Science editor:
The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it' s ready for the first decision.
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
(2) Company editor-in-chief:
I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

- Thank you for this comment. We have updated the tables accordingly.

Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

- Additional literature has been cited using the RCA, as mentioned in our response to Reviewer #2. Thank you.

—

We appreciate your continued interest and support. It has been a pleasure working with the reviewers and editor. Should additional changes be necessary, we will respond promptly to meet your expectations. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Authors