

Peer Review

Review of: "The Influence of an Artificial Intelligence Large Language Model (ChatGPT) on Orthopaedic Scientific Publishing: A Bibliometric Analysis"

Keivan Daneshvar¹

1. Inselspital, Universitätsspital Bern, Bern, Switzerland

Dear Authors,

Thank you for the opportunity to review your manuscript on temporal changes in orthopaedic publishing around the time of ChatGPT's release. The topic is timely, the dataset is impressively large, and the paper is clearly structured with informative figures.

At the same time, I believe the manuscript requires substantial revision before it can be considered for publication. In particular, I would suggest:

Softening the causal language throughout (including the title) and clearly framing the analysis as associative rather than demonstrating a direct "influence" of ChatGPT.

Strengthening the time-related analyses (e.g., interrupted time-series or segmented regression) to better address underlying trends and alternative explanations.

Reporting and interpreting effect sizes more explicitly, and emphasising that the observed differences, while statistically significant, are small in magnitude.

Justifying the use of EDAT to define pre- and post-ChatGPT periods, and discussing or analysing the implications of indexing lag (e.g., via a wash-in sensitivity analysis).

Providing more methodological detail and nuance around sentiment and lexical diversity metrics, including their limitations when applied to scientific abstracts.

Clarifying the time span ("multiple decades" vs. 2021–2025) and the handling of different article types.

Overall, I see this as a valuable exploratory contribution that can be strengthened considerably with more cautious interpretation, enhanced statistical modelling, and some clarifications in Methods and Discussion.

Kind regards,

Declarations

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.