

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

We thank the reviewers for their thoughtful critique and constructive criticism of our invited manuscript 02910032 titled “Perioperative Outcomes in Minimally Invasive Lumbar Spine Surgery: A Systematic Review”. We edited the manuscript and provided answers to the questions point-by-point. We hope that they address all the concerns expressed by the reviewers. All changes in the final manuscript have been highlighted in yellow so as to be more easily identifiable to the reviewers.

Thank you and we look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

**Reviewer #2903410**

Conclusion: Accept

*We thank the reviewer for the positive review of our manuscript.*

Comments to Authors: “Small Language polishing. The discussion is too simple and should be analyzed in depth”

*We reviewed the entire manuscript and made grammatical changes where they were needed.*

**Reviewer #3035478**

Conclusion: Accept

*We thank the reviewer for taking their time to review our manuscript and accept it for publication.*

Comments to Authors: “The only minor remark is that the article is maybe too concise and might benefit from further interpretation of some statements”

*We have expanded the Conclusion section of the manuscript and interpreted the findings of each surgical technique in-depth to make it more reader friendly.*

**Reviewer #2904760**

Conclusion: Major Revision

*We thank the reviewer for their thorough and critical review of our manuscript.*

Comments to Authors:

1. “The main disadvantage of this manuscript is it’s too comprehensive that the authors could not focus on a specific point to discuss”

*We agree with the reviewer’s statement that our manuscript is very comprehensive but that is exactly what we tried to achieve, as this was a systematic review of the literature. As such we wanted to present all the current evidence on the subject matter. We have expanded the conclusion section where we interpret in-depth the*

*findings from each surgical technique and discuss how these findings influence the field currently.*

2. “Statistical methods for pooling were not mentioned”

*We have now added this in the methods section.*

3. “Most of the discussion part is repeating results”

*We have expanded the discussion section of the manuscript so that it does not restate the results but interpret them and put them in context of the current state of minimally invasive lumbar spine surgery.*