

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 75500

Title: Return to work following shoulder arthroplasty: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05077771

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MSc

Professional title: Surgeon

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Greece

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-01

Reviewer chosen by: Jia-Qi Zhu

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-17 17:42

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-18 15:08

Review time: 21 Hours

Scientific quality	<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 Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<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
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" 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

This interesting and well-written study presents a review of returning to work after three different shoulder surgeries which are indicated in the treatment of different shoulder pathology, as well as for different age groups. however there are some flaws.The methodology used is not clear, although it is mentioned in the text it was carried out according to the PRISMA instructions. For example, the online search with the keywords used can not be reproduced. How many studies were initially evaluated and how many were excluded and why. The flow diagram will therefore need to be revised.

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 75500

Title: Return to work following shoulder arthroplasty: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05198253

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Chief Doctor, Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-01

Reviewer chosen by: Dong-Mei Wang

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-04-25 15:36

Reviewer performed review: 2022-04-30 10:42

Review time: 4 Days and 19 Hours

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Re-review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors compared the probability of patients returning to work after three types of shoulder arthroplasty, including total shoulder arthroplasty (TSA), reverse total shoulder arthroplasty (rTSA), and shoulder hemiarthroplasty (HA).. This is a very interesting entry point and an indicator of postoperative shoulder arthroplasty that is of interest to many patients. They found that TSA seems to be the best of the three. They also found that the intensity of the work affected the probability of the patient returning to work. This study can inform clinicians when making surgical choices and encouraged more comparative studies to evaluate the differences between the three treatment methods. I have some comments for this work as follows. 1. The background section needs to be expanded and is too brief. The historical course, and changes in shoulder replacement surgery should be added. 2. As a systematic review, the authors should write clearly the inclusion indicators as well as baseline information when describing the methodology, especially when there are more comparative indicators. 3. The inclusion process needs to be mentioned in the methodology, including the total number of articles, the number of articles retrieved in each database, how the screening was performed, and a statement of the relevant exclusion criteria. 4. The authors selected the keywords in different databases, is this leading to partial omission of literature? The authors need to explain accordingly or provide a more detailed search strategy 5. The article includes literature of low Evidence levels and high heterogeneity, and the limitations of the article need to be mentioned in the discussion section, as well as guidance for future research directions.

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Manuscript NO: 75500

Title: Return to work following shoulder arthroplasty: A systematic review

Provenance and peer review: Invited manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05198253

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: MD, PhD

Professional title: Academic Research, Chief Doctor, Doctor, Research Scientist

Reviewer's Country/Territory: China

Author's Country/Territory: United States

Manuscript submission date: 2022-02-01

Reviewer chosen by: Chen-Chen Gao

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-06-18 15:34

Reviewer performed review: 2022-06-19 03:56

Review time: 12 Hours

Scientific quality	<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
Language quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<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
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No



**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>

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Good work.