# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 67128

**Title:** Ergonomics of gastrointestinal endoscopies: Musculoskeletal injury among endoscopy physicians, nurses, and technicians

**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:** Pakistan

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** AI Technique

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-04-21 20:45

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-04-29 08:58

**Review time:** 7 Days and 12 Hours

| Scientific quality | [ ] Grade A: Excellent  [ ] Grade B: Very good  [ Y] Grade C: Good  [ ] Grade D: Fair  [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| 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)  [ ] Minor revision  [ Y] 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

revision requirieds

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

| Scientific quality | [  ] Grade A: Excellent    [  ] Grade B: Very good    [ Y] Grade C: Good [  ] Grade D: Fair    [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| **Language quality** | [  ] Grade A: Priority publishing    [  ] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing    [  ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [  ] Accept (High priority)    [  ] Accept (General priority) [  ] Minor revision    [  ] Major revision    [ Y] Rejection |
| **Re-review** | [ Y] Yes    [  ] No |

| **Peer-reviewer statements** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous    [    ] Onymous |
|---|---|
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [    ] Yes    [ Y] No |

## 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.   2) There was no aim mentioned in the introduction. 3) I would be interested to see the intervention to improve the ergonomics among participants, such as pre and post-intervention improvement 4) The survey used by authors was validated in previous paper? 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. 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?

# PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy*

**Manuscript NO:** 67128

**Title:** Ergonomics of gastrointestinal endoscopies: Musculoskeletal injury among endoscopy physicians, nurses, and technicians

**Provenance and peer review**: Unsolicited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

**Peer-review model:** Single blind

**Reviewer's code:** 05282786

**Position:** Editorial Board

**Academic degree:** MD, PhD

**Professional title:** Associate Professor, Consultant Physician-Scientist

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

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

**Manuscript submission date:** 2021-04-21

**Reviewer chosen by:** Ya-Juan Ma

**Reviewer accepted review:** 2021-05-30 07:53

**Reviewer performed review:** 2021-06-08 18:20

**Review time:** 9 Days and 10 Hours

| Scientific quality | [  ] Grade A: Excellent   [  ] Grade B: Very good   [ Y] Grade C: Good   [  ] Grade D: Fair   [  ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| **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

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. Also I suggest making a correlations betweend males and females working in endoscopy lab.

| Scientific quality | [ ] Grade A: Excellent   [ ] Grade B: Very good   [Y] Grade C: Good<br>[ ] Grade D: Fair   [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
|---|---|
| Language quality | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing   [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing<br>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing   [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| Conclusion | [ ] Accept (High priority)   [ ] Accept (General priority)<br>[ ] Minor revision   [Y] 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

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. Much effort should be given to arrange table 1. Font and alignments issues in the manuscript.

# RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

| | |
|---|---|
| **Scientific quality** | [ ] Grade A: Excellent   [ ] Grade B: Very good   [ Y] Grade C: Good<br>[ ] Grade D: Fair   [ ] Grade E: Do not publish |
| **Language quality** | [ ] Grade A: Priority publishing   [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing<br>[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing   [ ] Grade D: Rejection |
| **Conclusion** | [ ] Accept (High priority)   [ ] Accept (General priority)<br>[ Y] Minor revision   [ ] Major revision   [ ] Rejection |
| **Peer-reviewer** | Peer-Review: [ Y] Anonymous   [ ] Onymous |

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

## SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Minor revision requirieds