

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 68213

Title: Work-related musculoskeletal injuries among upper extremity surgeons: A

web-based survey

Reviewer's code: 05842368

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-15

Reviewer chosen by: AI Technique

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-05-25 01:04

Reviewer performed review: 2021-06-05 15:27

Review time: 11 Days and 14 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] 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

It is a well written article to uncover the prevalence and characteristics of MSK injury among upper extremity orthopedic surgeons, and authors also explored associated risk factors and explored the impact of these injuries on the surgeon's practice. Generally, it is a meaningful study, which could draw attention and promote development of operative room setup and ergonomics, and as a result reduce occupational hazards of surgeons. However, there are some problems with the manuscript. Major problems 1. The statistic method used in each comparison is not very clear, and I don't think one-way anova method is appropriate for this study. Actually, age, years in practice, annual caseload, etc. are independent variables, while the outcome (such as MSK injury or not) is dependent variable, and in this study all the dependent variables could only be divided into 2 groups (with MSK injury or not; with treatment or not; with time-off leave or not), so there is no need for one-way anova method. 2. For continuous variables like 'age' and 'annual caseload', I think student t test is more sensitive to detect difference between two groups (such as 'with MSK injury or not; with treatment or not; with time-off leave or not'), there is no need to divide these variables into different age groups or annual caseload groups. 3. The tables in the manuscript should be designed to be more scientific, logic and clear. Minor problems 1. There is no reference for the survey used in the study, or could add the modified version as a supplemental material 2. Are all the surgeons in ASES or CSES only do upper extremity practice? 3. Because the respondent rate is really low, If possible, authors could compare the democratic characteristics of responders with those of ASES or CSEC members. If similar, could partly reduce the bias.



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO: 68213

Title: Work-related musculoskeletal injuries among upper extremity surgeons: A

web-based survey

Reviewer's code: 05842368

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: Saudi Arabia

Manuscript submission date: 2021-05-15

Reviewer chosen by: Li-Li Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2021-07-29 14:29

Reviewer performed review: 2021-07-31 13:03

Review time: 1 Day and 22 Hours

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[Y] Grade A: Priority publishing [] 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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS



1. Why you chose 'one way anova' statistic method? This was not clearly answered. 2. I didn't find the Tables in the revised manuscript.