

Occupational Injuries and Burn Out Among Orthopedic Oncology Surgeons

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you for your additional review of our manuscript. Your comments are constructive and have been applied in the manuscript. Please find below a point-by-point response to your comments. We have modified the manuscript accordingly and hope that we have addressed all your suggestions. We look forward to your feedback.

Kindly note that all line references in the Author Response section and Text change section refer to the revised manuscript line numbering (unless specifically stated).

Reviewer Remark	Author Response	Revised Manuscript Line Number and text change.
REVIEWER 1:		
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. They reported that their prototype had improved the realistic sensation and experience of training, but the missing information of participants and	Thank you for this inciteful comment. We have modified the manuscript to discuss this aspect.	Page 9, Line 188: The surveys used in our current study included modified self-reported outcomes, which could be an area of limitation. Future research should be directed at studying the reliability, validity, and area of weaknesses of these surveys.

<p>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</p>		
<p>The figures, diagrams are not sufficient. There is no figure in manuscript!</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We have added two figures to the manuscript.</p>	<p>Figure 1 and 2</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment, the grammar and writing were revised throughout manuscript.</p>	
<p>REVIEWER 2:</p>		
<p>There are some grammatical errors in the manuscript. Please revise carefully and provide the electronic version of language polishing certificate</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment, the grammar and writing were revised throughout manuscript.</p>	
<p>The sample size is relatively small, and the research conclusions are not representative, which should be explained in the discussion</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We revised the limitation section to make this area clearer.</p>	<p>Page 9, line 190: One of the strengths of our study is that the study sample, although relatively small, is representative of the orthopedic oncology surgeons' population in North America and Europe, which is considered not a large population.</p>
<p>The reference format is not standardized and uniform.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The reference format has been revised</p>	

	accordingly.	
REVIEWER 3:		
what is the current prevalence of occupational injuries of oncologist surgeons? what gaps are you going to fill?	Thank you for your comment. Unfortunately, the prevalence of occupational injuries in our cohort has not been reported and thus this is the gap we are trying to fill.	
what are the limitations of your study?	Thank you for your comment. The limitations section has been revised accordingly.	Page 9, Line 188: The surveys used in our current study included modified self-reported outcomes, which could be an area of limitation. Future research should be directed at studying the reliability, validity, and area of weaknesses of these surveys.
why your not using other data analysis method than odd ratio?	Thank you for your comment. In addition to the descriptive statistics a logistic regression analysis was also applied.	
EDITOR:		
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 the comment. The tables have been revised accordingly.	
Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement	Thank you for the comment. The references have been reviewed and	

<p>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/.</p>	<p>updated.</p>	
--	-----------------	--