

**ESPS Peer-review Report**

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4828

**Title:** Communication after cancellations in orthopaedics: the patient perspective

**Reviewer code:** 00503838

**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 13:14

**Date reviewed:** 2013-07-26 14:09

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<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"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

**COMMENTS TO AUTHORS**

This is an interesting manuscript about doctor-patient communication. I think patients' satisfaction will be changed by the reasons of cancellation, for example, lack of theatre time or patients' poor condition. Authors should add the data and discussion in the relationship between patients' satisfaction and reasons of cancellation.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4828

**Title:** Communication after cancellations in orthopaedics: the patient perspective

**Reviewer code:** 00501315

**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 13:14

**Date reviewed:** 2013-07-28 07:00

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	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"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The doctor-patient's relationship is core problem in the medicine surrounding. This manuscript mainly discusses how to interpret the reason of cancellation of their operations in order to explain the importance of good communication between patients and doctor or nurse. This prospective study was a new method to explore patients' satisfaction and preferences for notification of cancellation of their operations, by doctor and nurse respectively. The simple results showed 48% Patients reported that they were dissatisfied with the explanation for cancellations. Of those 69.4% patients were dissatisfied notified by a nurse. There was a significant difference in satisfaction between those counseled by a nurse and those notified by a doctor, it seems patients were prefer to accept the cancellation of their operations notified by a doctor than this by a nurse. This prospective study evaluated reliability and validity. However, the sample size was smaller than the suggested in such kind of evaluation studies. The evaluating methods and indicators used in this study are suitable, but not detailed. The manuscript is well written and documented, and the data provides a new scientific basis to further study of communication between patients and doctor or nurse. The main comments and suggestions are as following: 1. In the abstract, the sentence "how patients interpret" should be "how patients' interpret". 2. In the Introduction, I suggest this section should be split into two paragraph from the sentence "To the best of our knowledge there has not been a study examining patients' perceptions.....". 3. In the methods section, it does not introduce if this survey was approved by Human Ethics Committee absolutely. 4. In the whole paper, Statistical analysis was not mentioned, what is the criterion of Identifying differences? 5. In the result part, author should better to add some table, figure to illustrate the results. 6. In reference 6, "42: 1100-1107" is different with other format. It should be "42: 1100-1107". 7. In the manuscript, no page number, no line number, it



## **Baishideng Publishing Group Co., Limited**

Flat C, 23/F., Lucky Plaza,  
315-321 Lockhart Road,  
Wan Chai, Hong Kong, China

---

seems not meet the format of common journal.

## ESPS Peer-review Report

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

**ESPS Manuscript NO:** 4828

**Title:** Communication after cancellations in orthopaedics: the patient perspective

**Reviewer code:** 00501329

**Science editor:** Song, Xiu-Xia

**Date sent for review:** 2013-07-26 13:14

**Date reviewed:** 2013-08-10 21:12

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	RECOMMENDATION	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A (Excellent)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority Publishing	Google Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B (Very good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C (Good)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: a great deal of language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> No records	<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D (Fair)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: rejected	BPG Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E (Poor)		<input type="checkbox"/> Existed	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> No records	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The goal of this paper was to examine the patients' perceptions on the communications surrounding cancellation of operations in orthopaedics and to identify areas for improvement in our communication skills. A prospective survey was undertaken at the department of Trauma and Orthopaedics. Main results showed that patients expected to be notified of cancellations and would prefer to be notified by a doctor rather than a member of the nursing team. Communication surrounding cancellations does not appear to meet patient expectations or preferences. This study illustrates the importance and affect of communication in the doctor-patient relationship. The topic of the study is relevant to World Journal of Orthopaedics. The rationale is well presented and the manuscript is clearly written. Consequently, I only have minor suggestions. Details on the statistics might be added at the end of the methods section. The panel of age ranged from 17 to 91 years. It is therefore very large. Could there be an effect of age on the results reported? Similarly, approximately half participants were female/male. Could there be an effect of sex? Making subgroups might be relevant to better target interventions. Authors wrote Page 7: "These findings are in keeping with other studies suggesting that physicians are the preferred source of information provision [12] and serve to illustrate the importance of the doctor-patient relationship". One single reference is provided whereas authors refer to several studies. Authors wrote Page 8: "This was demonstrated in our data where a failure to communicate or provide adequate explanation correlated with overall patient dissatisfaction with Communication ?. It is not clear to me where such correlation was established in the results.