

November 7th, 2021

Dear honorable Editor and Reviewers,

First of all, thank you very much for the constructive comments and we truly appreciate all the suggestions made by the Editor and reviewers. Hopefully the following explanations and changes are acceptable.

Thank you very much

We wish you all good days and kind regards,

Response to Editor and Reviewers:

Ms. Ref. No.: 69550, Systematic Reviews

Title: Prosthetic Joint Infection of the Hip and Knee Due to Mycobacterium Species: A Systematic Review

World Journal of Orthopaedic

| | Reviewer’s comments | Author’s response | Change in Manuscript |
|--------------|--|--|----------------------|
| Reviewer #1: | It is an interesting study. The authors conducted a systematic and comprehensive retrospective evaluation on knee/hip prosthetic joint infections caused by Mycobacterium Species, summarized the common Mycobacterium sp pathogens and their distribution ratios, and concluded the relevant treatment methods and clinical outcomes, which have clinical significance. However, the current version is not suitable for publication and many problems need to be carefully revised by the authors. | Thank you for your comments. We would like to revise this manuscript accordingly | No correction |
| | 1. After the full text has been polished by the polishing company, all the revised process and remarks are still presented in the article, and | Thank you for your comments. We will make sure upload the final version of | No correction |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| | <p>the authors should make changes according to those remarks and upload the final revised version instead of uploading an unfinished version.</p> | <p>the file.</p> | |
| | <p>2. Please revise and adjust the format carefully for figure 1. In addition, figure 2 4 5 is too elementary, I hope the author will further beautify and revise it.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. We modify the figure.</p> | <p>Figure 1,2,4,5 modified</p> |
| | <p>3. In Table 2, p-values should be presented comparatively for each data instead of sharing one value for several data, such as onset time > 3 months and < 3 months</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. The included p value was the results of all included variable test. We may think no need correction in this issue.</p> | <p>No correction</p> |
| | <p>4. Although the authors mentioned in the discussion section that they only used one database for literature search due to their long-time span (30 years), since this paper is a systematic analysis, I still strongly suggest the authors to use at least one more database for search, such as Embase, WOS, etc., to avoid losing important references.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. We agree that some paper could be missed. However, we still believed that with the use of PubMed with long-time span, the majority of high quality of paper will be included in this study.</p> | <p>No correction</p> |
| | <p>5. The results section does not describe the literature search process, that is to say, it does not elaborate on the content of Figure 1.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. Elaboration of Figure I was actually has</p> | <p>No correction</p> |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | <p>6. The discussion section is too brief and is clearly substandard for a systematic review. The authors need to discuss in depth the comparison with other infectious organisms (percentage of infection, treatment modality, time of onset, clinical outcome).</p> <p>7. In addition, in the direction of treatment, the authors should develop further discussion on which treatment regimen is the most appropriate in each type of case, with the highest bacterial control rate and the highest survival rate. Beside this, it would be advisable to make a flow chart of the confirmation of the diagnosis of Mycobacterium sp of the knee and hip as an aid to the discussion part.</p> | <p>been included in the Material and Method (<i>Data collection/extraction</i>)</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. We modify the discussion section. Comparison with other organism was added.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. As most of the included paper is a case report with limitation of final outcome data. We could not elaborate any advisable treatment/ flowchart for Mycobacterium PJI from this study. Some modification is added.</p> | <p>Discussion section Line 216-222</p> <p>Discussion section. Line 230-231</p> |
| <p><i>Science editor:</i></p> | <p>This review is very interesting and clearly written. But there are still some problems that need fixing. It is unacceptable to have more than 3 references from the same journal. To resolve this issue and move forward in the peer-review/publication process, please revise your reference list accordingly.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. It is difficult to avoid 3 references from the same journal. Because it need to include all relevant study for this review (Although they are</p> | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | | from the same journal). | |
| <i>Company editor-in-chief:</i> | <p>Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.</p> <p>Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments. We provide the original file of PPT for figure and table.</p> | <p>Figure and table file is provided in separate file</p> |

Re-review:

Answer: Thanks for your comments.