

Dear editors and reviewers

Thanks for reaching out to us regarding the manuscript entitled " ***Investigation of Litigation in Trauma Orthopaedic Surgery***". We believe that these comments have helped us enhance the quality of the manuscript. We also have done our best to revise as well as improve the paper according to the comments. Herewith, we provided the authors' respond to each comment right after each statement. Also, all the changes have been highlighted in the manuscript. Please feel free to contact us if you need further information.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

#### **Reviewer #1:**

Specific Comments to Authors:

Manuscript title Investigation of Litigation in Trauma Orthopaedic Surgery I congratulate the authors for this interesting and crucial subject which is interesting to all orthopedic surgeons The manuscript is well written.

Thank you for your time and effort in evaluating the manuscript. I hope the answers are clear to your valuable comments on the article. Your opinion can improve the quality of the manuscript and decrease misunderstanding.

Only the first line in the results sections, the figures need to be revised because does not look logic

Duly noted. Thank you for pointing out this shortcoming. We have revised it the first line of result section and also illustrated a figure to demonstrate the pathway of patient selection and diminishing the possible misunderstanding. We also have revised the figures

#### **Reviewer #2:**

Specific Comments to Authors:

01 "Among the 938 legal claims during the 10 years mentioned above, 122 were related to orthopedic issues. After reviewing the files one by one, a total of 228 claims referred to trauma-related conditions, fulfilled our inclusion criteria and were enrolled in the study." There is something wrong here. The aim of the study was to investigate the cases of medical complaints in orthopedic patients. There were 228 claims referred to trauma-related conditions. However, only 122 were related to orthopedic issues. How come the investigated included 228 claims, if only 122 were related to orthopedic issues?

Thank you and we do apologize for this typo and misunderstanding. The total claims of orthopedics were 322 among them 228 ones related to trauma orthopedics. We have illustrated a figure to demonstrate the pathway of patient selection and diminish the possible misunderstanding. Thank you

02 What did the authors compare in Table 1? How come the authors only had information about the frequency of males (n = 162) and females (n = 66) in the cohort group, and still were able to make a statistical comparison? This is all wrong. The same is valid for all other variables included in Table 1.

We apologize due to this misunderstanding the table's footnote has been added in order to resolve any issues according to statistical analysis.

03 There are some sentences in the text without reference to a previous study (or studies) in order to give evidence to their statements. Without references, these statements would be mere assumptions or allegations by the authors of the manuscript. Therefore, each of the following sentences need at least one reference to back up their statement: "Hospitals infrastructure, surgical equipment, operating rooms, and orthopedic surgeons all play a role in determining the outcome of a patient's surgery. Training for high-risk cases of patient complaints and ongoing training throughout practice is quite beneficial. Trauma surgeons' training needs to be more competency-based and behavioral training in dealing with problems and legal issues; considering that most trauma surgeons are newly graduated, preventing these incidents is essential." "To avoid being accused of incompetence, surgeons may use a recommendation to validate surgical skills developed across a career. Physicians may rest easy knowing they are getting the best care possible from surgeons who are aware of their limitations and will refer them to specialists if necessary."

Thank you for this insightful suggestion. The discussion section has been through a noticeable change and we tried to resolve any issue relating to the mentioned comments.

04 Most of the Discussion section consists of paragraphs beginning with a repetition of the results followed by the citation of the results of other studies, without an actual discussion of the findings of the study. In other words, a discussion of the findings is inexistent.

Thank you for noticing this point. The discussion section has been through a noticeable change and we tried to resolve any issue relating to the mentioned comments.

05 "The remedies to these issues are knowledge, practical surgical expertise, and behavioral education." This is not a conclusion from your work. This is a recommendation, and should stay only in the Discussion.

Duly noted. Thank you for pointing out this shortcoming. We have revised the conclusion part.