

Round-1

Dear Jin-Lei Wang,

Company Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Office

We are thankful to all the reviewers and the editorial board for taking out valuable time and addressing our manuscript. We took great heed to the points raised and all were of great value to the authors and helped the team in honing the manuscript to its best form. We have addressed all the reviewers in as much detail as possible, including the science and company editor comments. We now believe the manuscript is in its finest form and hope all issues raised have been satisfactorily answered. We hope this manuscript is now acceptable for publication. Once again, we are thankful to the reviewers and editorial committee for their valuable feedback and time.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I find the idea of this study quite interesting. However, I need to notice that all of the subjects (endoscopists, nurses and technicians were observed together, although their role in the endoscopy in room is not the same (for example endoscopic procedure is performed only by endoscopist himself). In that case, eventual musculoskeletal injuries are been evaluated nonselective. On the other hand, the idea and the theme of the study is valuable. a. We have stratified the data as suggested into subgroups; endoscopists, residents, nurses, and technicians. And have addressed it in our manuscript and updated it on the most recent file uploaded.

Much effort should be given to arrange table 1. b. Table 1 has been modified. Furthermore, facilitating the reviewer's comment, we have developed two more tables. Table 2 has been introduced explaining sub-analysis for stratified data according to endoscopists, residents, nurses, and technicians. Table 3 sheds light on gender-based stratification in MSI.

Font and alignments issues in the manuscript. c. Font and alignment issues have been fixed according to Guidelines_and_Requirements_for_Manuscript_Revision-Guidelines"

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The paper is quite well conducted but I think there are some points missing: - correlations between the complexity of the procedure and the musculoskeletal injuries – correlations between the durations of the procedure and the musculoskeletal injuries. We know that the trainees are younger than experimented endoscopists but they are expected to performed longer procedures but less complex and is interesting to see how is the impact on musculoskeletal injuries. In our country's medical setup, the endoscopist isn't procedure-specific; the endoscopist performing ERCP and EUS are also performing conventional endoscopy and colonoscopy;

It is difficult to stratify and evaluate the correlation-based upon the complexity and length of the procedure; i.e., one single individual is performing all kinds of procedures; however, we can correlate the frequency of MSK injury based upon the length/level of experience. In our opinion, the level of experience and length of exposure to the endoscopic procedure is more significant than knowing the distribution of MSK according to the type of procedure.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to stratify data on MSK based on the type of procedure as in our setup, the endoscopists and ancillary staff are performing all types of procedures (ERCP, EUS, and conventional endoscopies).

Also I suggest making a correlations between males and females working in endoscopy lab. The relationship between genders was rightly pointed out by the reviewer. It has now been addressed in Table 3.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Rejection

Specific Comments to Authors: First of all, I would like to thank authors for conducting research on this very important topic in the field of GI. This is an observational study involving around 60 participants, focusing on musculoskeletal injury in GI physicians, endoscopy nurse and technician. Because of following major concerns, I would reject this manuscript.

1) Author should have done sub-analysis involving only GI physician's musculoskeletal injury and not including endoscopy nurse or technician, as they are not involved in the repetitive torquing movements. 1. We have stratified the data as suggested into subgroups; endoscopists, residents, nurses, and technicians. Introduced a new table (Table2) in our latest updated manuscript addressing this sub analysis.

2) There was no aim mentioned in the introduction. 2. *Aim* has been added to the end of the Introduction portion of the manuscript.

3) I would be interested to see the intervention to improve the ergonomics among participants, such as pre and post-intervention improvement. 3. This is a very important point. Unfortunately, this was not an aim/objective of our study and would require a prospective follow-up study.

4) The survey used by authors was validated in previous paper? 4. The questions asked in the survey were made on evaluating previously published papers and keeping their context in mind. We extrapolated questions and choose the ones best fit for our objectives, environment, and circumstances. We also accounted for the feasibility of implementation. The developed questionnaire underwent a pilot study at our institute; was tested and modified accordingly.

5) The total number of participants were only 60 and physicians/ trainee were only 22, therefore could create sampling bias. I would prefer to see more participants with more sites involvement to derive meaningful conversation. 5. This observation from the reviewer is correct. Although we have covered three tertiary care institutes in our metropolitan city (Karachi, Pakistan; a city of 20 million people) and have tried our best with the limited resources and hindrances during this pandemic in our resource-limited country; we tried to conduct with the most respondents as possible.

6) I would like to see the risk factors responsible for more musculoskeletal injuries (i.e. any particular behavior) among participants. Can author work on it? 6. This is an interesting point. We have

unfortunately not evaluated individual behavior in this study. We also found a dearth of information shedding light on this context.

Reviewer #4:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: revision required

Answer to Reviewer 4

All revisions have been made and fixed in the article according to the file attached by the reviewer. The authors thank the reviewer for taking the time out for marking individual mistakes on the word file making this process easier.

4 LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

All language-related issues have been solved according to the peer review reports. The article has been run through Grammarly, a language and grammar scrutinizing online tool. Furthermore, a native English speaker has proofread this manuscript. Native English speaker certificate attached.

The authors have also tried their level best to scrutinize the English of this article to the best of their ability.

6 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) *Science editor:* 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an observational study of the ergonomics of gastrointestinal endoscopies. The topic is within the scope of the WJGE. (1) Classification:

Grade C, Grade C, Grade C and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors report an article involving around 60 participants, focusing on musculoskeletal injury in GI physicians, endoscopy nurse and technician. It is quite well conducted and important. However, the questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There is 1 table and 2 figures. (4) References: A total of 17 references are cited, including 6 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references; and (6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B, Grade B, Grade C and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. The STROBE Statement needs to add the page number. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJGE. 5 Issues raised: (1) The language classification is Grade C. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>; (2) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words; (3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (4) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Answer to Science Editor:

- a. All language and grammatical related issues have been solved according to the peer review reports. The article has been run through Grammarly, a language scrutinizing online tool. Furthermore, a native English speaker has proofread this manuscript. The authors have tried their level best to scrutinize the English of this article to the best of their ability.
- b. The authors feel the title to be adequate according to the manuscript. Our current title has 12 words. Added input from the science editor would be appreciated.
- c. Figures and tables have been provided in Microsoft Word and Microsoft PowerPoint respectively.
- d. "Article Highlights" section has been added

(2) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy, 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. A re-review is required for the revised manuscript.

We would once again like to thank the peer reviewers for their detailed reviews and also the science and company editors for their valuable feedback. We believe our manuscript to be much more polished, refined, and reader-friendly after the amendments described above and is acceptable for publication.

Please do not hesitate to point out any further corrections in our article. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Dr. Shahab Abid

Round-2

Modifications have been made based on the reviewers' comments.

musculoskeletal injuries-MSI

Three tertiary care hospitals namely, Aga Khan University Hospital, Liaquat National Hospital, and Dr. Ruth K. M. Pfau Civil Hospital, all located in Karachi, Pakistan had their endoscopy physicians, nurses and technicians approached.

mean \pm SD

carpal tunnel syndrome-CTS