

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 80675

**Title:** Investigation of Litigation in Trauma Orthopaedic Surgery

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 04668002

**Position:** Associate Editor

**Academic degree:** DDS, MSc, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Doctor

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-10-09 14:12

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-10-09 14:28

**Review time:** 1 Hour

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input checked="" 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 Grade E: Do not publish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 type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No
------------	---------------------------------------

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

01 “Among the 938 legal claims during the 10 years mentioned above, 122 were related to orthopedic issues. After reviewing the files one by one, a total of 228 claims referred to trauma-related conditions, fulfilled our inclusion criteria and were enrolled in the study.”

There is something wrong here. The aim of the study was to investigate the cases of medical complaints in orthopedic patients. There were 228 claims referred to trauma-related conditions. However, only 122 were related to orthopedic issues. How come the investigated included 228 claims, if only 122 were related to orthopedic issues?

02 What did the authors compare in Table 1? How come the authors only had the information about the frequency of males (n = 162) and females (n = 66) in the cohort group, and still were able to make a statistical comparison? This is all wrong. The same is valid for all other variables included in Table 1.

03 There are some sentences in the text without reference to a previous study (or studies) in order to give evidence to their statements. Without references, these statements would be mere assumptions or allegations by the authors of the manuscript. Therefore, each of the following sentences need at least one reference to back up their statement: “Hospitals infrastructure, surgical equipment, operating rooms, and orthopedic surgeons all play a role in determining the outcome of a patient's surgery. Training for high-risk cases of patient complaints and ongoing training throughout practice is quite beneficial. Trauma surgeons' training needs to be more competency-based and behavioral training in dealing with problems and legal issues; considering that most trauma surgeons are newly graduated, preventing these incidents is essential.” “To avoid being accused of incompetence, surgeons may use a recommendation to validate surgical skills developed across a career. Physicians may rest easy knowing they are getting the best care possible from surgeons



**Baishideng  
Publishing  
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite  
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA  
**Telephone:** +1-925-399-1568  
**E-mail:** [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)  
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

who are aware of their limitations and will refer them to specialists if necessary.” 04  
Most of the Discussion section consists of paragraphs beginning with a repetition of the  
results followed by the citation of the results of other studies, without an actual  
discussion of the findings of the study. In other words, a discussion of the findings is  
inexistent. 05 “The remedies to these issues are knowledge, practical surgical expertise,  
and behavioral education.” This is not a conclusion from your work. This is a  
recommendation, and should stay only in the Discussion.

## PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

**Manuscript NO:** 80675

**Title:** Investigation of Litigation in Trauma Orthopaedic Surgery

**Provenance and peer review:** Invited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05446574

**Position:** Peer Reviewer

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Surgeon

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

**Author's Country/Territory:** Iran

**Manuscript submission date:** 2022-10-09

**Reviewer chosen by:** Dong-Mei Wang

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2022-11-15 13:33

**Reviewer performed review:** 2022-11-18 23:08

**Review time:** 3 Days and 9 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous



**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>

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

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

Manuscript title Investigation of Litigation in Trauma Orthopaedic Surgery I congratulate the authors for this interesting and crucial subject which is interesting to all orthopedic surgeons The manuscript is well written. Only the first line in the results sections, the figures need to be revised because does not look logic