

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28921

**Title:** Internet and social media usage of orthopaedic patients: A questionnaire-based survey

**Reviewer's code:** 02444695

**Reviewer's country:** Austria

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 08:16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-23 18:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is a very interesting manuscript. Limitation I see is, that it reflects the Situation in Turkey, which cannot be transferred completely to other countries. This should be noted in Discussion.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

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

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 28921

**Title:** Internet and social media usage of orthopaedic patients: A questionnaire-based survey

**Reviewer's code:** 02444722

**Reviewer's country:** Greece

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2016-07-26 08:16

**Date reviewed:** 2016-09-23 18:22

CLASSIFICATION	LANGUAGE EVALUATION	SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT	CONCLUSION
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	Google Search:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Accept
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	<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"/> Duplicate publication	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Rejection
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Minor revision
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor		BPG Search:	<input type="checkbox"/> [ ] Major revision
		<input type="checkbox"/> The same title	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism	
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> [ Y] No	

According to the authors the purpose of the present investigation was to evaluate social media usage of orthopaedic patients to search for and seek solutions to their health problems in Turkey. With the usage of face-to-face questionnaire consisted of 16 questions, a large number of patients (n=1890) participated in the present investigation. Based on the results of the questionnaires, authors concluded that patients in Turkey have been increasingly using the internet and social media to select a specific physician or to seek solution to their health problems in an effective way.

It is an interesting study, however, authors have to respond in some questions and corrections in order the manuscript to be clearer for the reader.

### Comments

Abstract, Results, lines 17, 19, 21

The significant differences presented here are in relation to all other groups? For instance, the internet (for asking questions to an orthopaedist) was significant difference compare to each one of the other

means of communication? The same question stands also for the other significant differences.

Abstract, Results, line 19

Please replace  $p=0,021$  with  $p=0.021$

Introduction

Authors should give some information about their choice to use orthopaedic patients for their investigation. This information have to be included and the in the Discussion section.

Results, line 113

What all these significant differences stand for? Please explain.

Results, lines 118-120

This sentence is not clear. Authors mention that there was a significant difference but they do not mention between which groups.

Tables

In some cases tables are very confusing since the sum % of each answer is not 100%. Authors have to check their tables or explain the different outcomes in a footnote or in the methods section.

Tables 5 and 6

Authors have to state between which groups the significant differences (p values) stand for. Again, the sum of % of each group does not equals 100%.