

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61265

Title: SARS-CoV-2, surgeons and surgical masks

Reviewer's code: 05301514

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-01 17:07

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-03 18:11

Review time: 2 Days and 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This study verified the necessity of facemask use for surgeons to prevent COVID-19. The concept of this study is important to prevent SARS-CoV-2 infection, as surgeons are at high risk of being exposed to droplets from patients. The manuscript is well-written. I have several comments below:

1. Title The authors' title is good. This title clearly and concisely outlines the main points of the research. (The authors don't need any revision on the title.)
2. ABSTRACT On page 3, line 12: "Fourteen primary studies that provided data on COVID-19 infection or experience among surgeons..." The term "COVID-19 infection" may be incorrect. "SARS-CoV-2 infection" or simply "COVID-19" may be correct. The authors should revise this part. (In the Core tip section, the authors described "14 primary studies that provided data on COVID-19 among surgeons".)
3. SEARCH STRATEGY On page 6, lines 19-22: " 'coronavirus\$.tw.' were combined with terms on surgeon\$ or clinician\$ or practitioner\$.tw, health\$ or hospital\$ or clinical\$ or medical\$, health care worker\$" or hcw or doctor\$ or nurs\$ or "allied health\$" or dental or dentist\$.tw. intensivist\$ or anaesthetist\$ or anesthetist\$.tw." " \$ " should be corrected to " * ". As far as I searched the Lancet literature, it seemed that " * " was commonly used. Or the authors can simply delete " \$ " . In the BMJ literature, any " \$ " or " * " were not used. e.g.) Viner RM, et al. School closure and management practices during coronavirus outbreaks including COVID-19: a rapid systematic review. Lancet Child Adolesc Health. 2020. " We searched using PubMed using search terms..."middle east respiratory syndrome*" [tw] OR "MERS-CoV" [tw] OR Mers [tw] OR "Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome*" [tw] OR "MERSCoV*" [tw] OR coronavirus [mh] OR Coronavirus Infections [mh] OR coronavirus* [tw]..." e.g.) Fan KS, et al. COVID-19 prevention and treatment information on the internet: a systematic analysis and quality assessment. BMJ Open. 2020. "...more search terms were used: 'Coronavirus', 'COVID 19', 'Stop getting Coronavirus', 'Corona Virus', 'How to treat coronavirus', 'Coronavirus



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-399-1568
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

safety tips', 'Drugs for coronavirus', 'What is self isolation coronavirus', 'China virus', 'Wuhan virus', 'Coronavirus Medicine' and 'COVID 19 prevention'. 4. DISCUSSION
On page 10, lines 15-16: "Although the incidence of COVID-19 was higher among HCWs including surgeons, the incidence of severe or critical disease was lower than among general community." I agree with this fact. I am curious about the reason why mortality among HCWs was lower compared to the mortality in all patients. How do you think why it is? If you can mention the reason for this fact with reference to past literature, please describe it.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 61265

Title: SARS-CoV-2, surgeons and surgical masks

Reviewer's code: 05301514

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Chief Doctor, Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Japan

Author's Country/Territory: Australia

Manuscript submission date: 2020-12-01

Reviewer chosen by: Le Zhang

Reviewer accepted review: 2020-12-28 04:51

Reviewer performed review: 2020-12-28 11:38

Review time: 6 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

All comments have been properly addressed. There is only one thing I would like to

point out. ABSTRACT, on page 3, line 16: “ had COVID, there could be...” “COVID” may be a typo. “COVID-19” may be correct.