

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Orthopedics

**Manuscript NO:** 65863

**Title:** Machine learning in orthopaedic surgery

**Reviewer's code:** 05418785

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** PhD

**Professional title:** Assistant Professor

**Reviewer's Country/Territory:** Poland

**Author's Country/Territory:** United States

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-03-17

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-15 23:47

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-18 16:28

**Review time:** 2 Days and 16 Hours

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<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
<b>Re-review</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

#### **SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

I find the article as a very good review. The presented statements proves the understanding of machine learning tools. Even my lack of medicine education and experience, I can recognize the oresentation of different appliations of ML in medicine. So, I do confirm the coprehensive character of the mauscript. Please find below minor specific remarks. If they are considered - in my opinion there is no need of the second round of reviewing. Specific mino remarks: Section: What is ML? Why not to mention artificial neural networks among the ML tools mentioned? ANN are also applied as conventional ML tools. Does in "... ML requires computer systems to "learn" patterns... " "computer systems" mean "software". "Software" would be more suitable. Section: Types of ML "More often than not, ..." ??? What does it mean? Section: DL and Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) What about predictive function of CNN? Predicting values by CNN based on images is also applied. May be not in medical applications but generally is one of their function. DL term refers also to the case where sound files (not only images) serves as an input. The last paragraph on page 5. "DL algorithms, such as ANN and CNN..." ANN are applied not exclusively for DL. Please consider the shape of the sentence: DL algorithms have been applied... Then the tense. I would say: DL algorithms are successfully applied....