

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 83153

Title: The efficacy and safety of intravenous tranexamic acid in total shoulder

arthroplasty: a meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 02482011 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Turkey

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-09

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-01-09 12:16

Reviewer performed review: 2023-01-17 09:19

Review time: 7 Days and 21 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
[] Grade D: No scientific significance
[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
[Y]Yes []No
Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Minor revision requirieds



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 83153

Title: The efficacy and safety of intravenous tranexamic acid in total shoulder

arthroplasty: a meta-analysis

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05213310 Position: Editorial Board Academic degree: PhD

Professional title: Adjunct Professor, Full Professor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-01-09

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-02-13 18:42

Reviewer performed review: 2023-02-15 09:47

Review time: 1 Day and 15 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
tino munuocript	1 Joing D. No creativity of fillovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
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 statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Please make the following changes: 1. The title of the paper should be changed to be more appealing and in line with the purpose of the current study. 2. In the results section of the study abstract, the most important findings of the current study should be highlighted without exaggeration. 3. Devoting the final paragraph of the study's introduction to highlighting the research problem and how to solve it within the framework of the current study's objective. 4. What are the current study's future directions? I hope to work on this direction in the current study, highlighting the study's strengths as well as the limitations mentioned in the last paragraph of the discussion section. 5. Rewrite the conclusion in a more orderly and focused manner on whether or not the current study achieves its objectives. 6. Some references are out of date after 2015, which necessitates updating them or excluding them and replacing them with what is new. 7. Is the percentage of plagiarism and self citation from references within the parameters set by the journal's policy? 8. Are the statistical graphics in the current study the work of the researcher/researchers, or do they come from somewhere else? Please elaborate. If it comes from another source, the property rights and approval of the third



party must be considered as much as possible before allowing use. Good luck,