PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 79775

Title: Occupational injuries and burn out among orthopedic oncology surgeons

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06323281

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Academic Research, Lecturer, Researcher

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Ethiopia

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-22 12:40

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-22 13:10

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

what is the current prevalence of occupational injuries of oncologist surgeons? what gaps are you going to fill? what are the limitations of your study? why your not using other data analysis method than odd ratio?

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish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

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The content of the manuscript is still good, but some questions need to be answered by the author: 1. There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript. Please revise carefully and provide the electronic version of language polishing certificate. 2.The sample size is relatively small, and the research conclusions are not representative, which should be explained in the discussion. 3. The reference format is not standardized and uniform.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 79775

Title: Occupational injuries and burn out among orthopedic oncology surgeons

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06362230

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Portugal

Author's Country/Territory: Canada

Manuscript submission date: 2022-09-17

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-09-18 08:59

Reviewer performed review: 2022-09-26 13:05

Review time: 8 Days and 4 Hours

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
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study describes a method that assess the prevalence and characteristics of occupational injuries among orthopedic oncology surgeons. 1- Title well reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript. 2- Abstract summarize and reflect the work described regarding Orthopedic Oncology Surgeons' Occupational Injuries and Burnout.

3- All key words reflect the focus of the manuscript professionally. 4- The paper presents a new way of methodology in Musculoskeletal Tumor Society (MSTS), the Canadian (CANOOS), and the European Musculoskeletal Oncology Societies regarding orthopedic oncology surgeons to participate in a physical discomfort web-based survey to examine the occurrence and trends of occupational injuries (EMSOS). It seems like a good prototype that would be of Interests for researchers working with pattern recognition. In other words, A theoretical or methodological contribution that provokes novel conversations for the discipline. 5- The manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail The design concept of the final prototype looks exciting and promising for measuring Occupational Injuries . Additionally, the details of prototype evaluation and setup is relatively good. Nevertheless, the evaluation measures and experiment protocols for those prototypes were not well described. 6- This result does not indicate the validity of other future research directions mentioned in the discussion. The usage of the dataset is still questionable. The effectiveness of the proposed system will be validated if it is possible to provide quantitative analysis on usability, learnability, etc., from the data in different environments perspectives. A system configuration is generally well written, but it needs more details. In other words, the effect/improvement of the proposed system is not clear. The experimental protocol and measure are not addressed well. 7-

They reported that their prototype had improved the realistic sensation and experience of training, but the missing information of participants and lack of illustration of feedback from the user test makes the validity weak. Therefore, this factor needs to be revised and as illustrated in future work, the field research for evaluation. Effectiveness and comparison with previous methods would be helpful. The design concept of the final prototype looks exciting and promising for training logistic regression. However, the details of prototype evaluation is relatively a bit weak. 8- The figures, diagrams are not sufficient. There is no figure in manuscript! 9- This is a challenging topic but one that is being tackled by several research teams around the world. The option of applying regression technique to this data is a valid approach for the task at hand. Results and conclusions might be particularly interesting for surgeons in healthcare institute and researchers in hospitals. 10- Yes, the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? 11- The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections and the author correctly cite references. 12- The prototype is described and the experience of using the prototype are reported as well. Furthermore, the article is well constructed, the experiments were well conducted, and analysis was well performed. The manuscript needs to be edited for grammar and syntax and should put more emphasis on the relations between the case study and future research 13- the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. 14- Yes, the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics.