

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**Manuscript NO:** 32869

**Title:** Upper extremity disorders in heavy industry workers in Greece

**Reviewer's code:** 00646701

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2017-02-03

**Date reviewed:** 2017-02-24

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		[Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		BPG Search:	
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		[Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, I found this manuscript to be well-written. The introduction and purpose statement were appropriate. The methods were clearly described. Overall, presentation of the results were appropriate and conclusions appear to be appropriate given the data collected and analysis conducted. Abstract & Methods Please confirm the number of study participants as there appears to be a discrepancy in numbers. Introduction The purpose statement, while appropriate, requires some revision to increase clarity. Please consider revising to read...probably should read that the study was conducted "to analyze disability....and to identify relationships between movement restrictions..." Methods When discussing your statistical analyses you note a p-value of 0.05. Given the number of analyses was there any consideration given to adjusting the p-value. If not, please provide some rationale. Results On page 7, following table 1 the sentence should read "Comparing the mean values, the work category scores were slightly lower than the other two, with a 1.704 mean value (Table 2)." In addition to providing the regression tables, please provide the regression equations that were



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

7901 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 501, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

derived from your analyses to facilitate the usefulness of this information for the readers. Discussion In the second paragraph of this section there is a typographical error. I believe you are indicating that participants “denied” any restrictions. Third paragraph, the sentence should read, “ Especially given certain...” Could you please expand on your discussion associated with symptoms, work ability and productivity. Additionally, in the paragraph that follows, could you please further elaborate on your discussion of the findings associated with education and the other sections of the QD. It is indeed interesting that this association did not continue with the other sections of the detail. Please provide further discussion and possible explanation for these results.