

Dear Lian-Sheng Ma,

Thank you very much for your preview and peer review of our manuscript (Manuscript NO: 65448 Impact of enhanced recovery pathways on safety and efficiency for hip and knee arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis). We revised the article according to the reviewers' comments and suggestions.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This work was conducted on an actual topic, the enhancement of recovery pathways in patients after THA and TKA; it is a well written and structured article, the systematic review and meta-analysis were sufficiently elaborated and presented data are statistically significant. Although this, I have one question as a main issue: how can we consider under one recovery pathway groups of patients after UKA, TKA and THA; in my opinion these are different categories, needing different approaches for their recovery, therefore different cost of treatment and time for recovery. I suggest presenting separately the results of patients after different arthroplasties.

RESPONSE: We would like to thank the reviewer for the positive feedback!

Regarding the question, we presented the results subdivided for type of arthroplasty (THA, TKA and/or UKA). If no distinction between the different arthroplasties was possible, analysis for the combined group were included as a subgroup (THA and/or TKA and/ or UKA). The results for the different arthroplasties are described and presented within forest plots.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

(1) Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a systematic review of the impact of enhanced recovery pathways on safety and efficiency for hip and knee arthroplasty.

The topic is within the scope of the WJO. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: It is a well written and structured article, the systematic review and meta-analysis were sufficiently elaborated and presented data are statistically significant. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 9 figures; (4) References: A total of 71 references are cited, including 2 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJO. 5 Issues raised:

- (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. 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.

RESPONSE: PowerPoint file for Figures and Word file for Tables are submitted with the revised manuscript

- (2) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

RESPONSE: The "Article Highlights" section is added in the revised manuscript, after the "Conclusion"

6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Orthopedics, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

RESPONSE: Revisions done as needed

Thank you for all suggestions.

Best regards,

Marion Heymans