

Manuscript NO.: 55063

Title: THE ROLE OF PULSED ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELDS AFTER JOINT REPLACEMENTS

Authors: Giada Lullini, Eugenio Cammisa, Stefania Setti, Iacopo Sassoli, Stefano Zaffagnini and Giulio Maria Marcheggiani Muccioli

Corresponding author: Giulio Maria Marcheggiani Muccioli, MD, PhD, Academic Research, Adjunct Professor, Doctor, II Orthopaedic and Traumatology Clinic, IRCCS Istituto Ortopedico Rizzoli - DIBINEM - University of Bologna, via Pupilli 1, Bologna 40100, Italy. marcheggianimuccioli@me.com

Received Date: 2020-03-01

First decision: 2020-04-26

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the Editor of World Journal of Orthopedics and to the reviewers for spending their time to revise the paper.

We have highly appreciated the depth of the reviewers' comments and we hope these are here fully addressed in the current revision.

A point-by-point answers to each of these comments are reported below.

A corresponding version of the revised Manuscript has been submitted following instructions for revision

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This review presents the current knowledge on pulsed electromagnetic fields (PEMFs) effects in joint replacement surgery and reports the results of clinical studies and current indications. The authors selected currently available prospective studies to evaluate the effects of PEMFs on recovery, pain relief and patients' satisfaction following hip, knee or shoulder arthroplasty. All the studies analyzed reported no adverse effects, and good patient compliance to the treatment. Thus, PEMFs may be considered as a safe treatment, generally well tolerated by the patients. However, further studies should be conducted on the long-term effects of PEMFs on implants integration and survival. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript. The abstract and key words reflect the main topics of the entire text. The review is informative and helpful. The table captures information concisely and is illustrative of the paper contents. The review cites the relevant and important references and gives a complete picture of the topic. I suggest to accept the manuscript with no specific comments.

Authors would like to thank you very much for your comments and for spending your precious time on this paper. We hope the manuscript will be published soon.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a good but very short review article. Please expand on the content and make it more comprehensive. It would be better to convert it into a systematic review and fulfill all the PRISMA checklist items. Please add an abstract. The references are too few. I would suggest expanding the review.

Authors would like to thank you very much for your suggestions and for spending your precious time on this paper.

We expanded the content and made the manuscript more comprehensive as you suggested. We expanded both the references and the review as requested. However, it was not in authors' first intent to provide a systematic review of the literature. Moreover, not enough evidences were found in the literature (in terms of number of studies, and quality and validity of trials) in order to meet PRISMA Checklist Criteria and perform a systematic review of the literature. Authors believe the revision provided in this paper is however a very good contribution to scientific community on this field.

We added and abstract as required

Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript is a review of the role of pulsed electromagnetic fields after joint replacements. The topic is in the scope of WJO. (1) Classification: Grade A and C. (2) Summary of the peer-review report: This is a good but very short review article. Please expand on the content and make it more comprehensive. It would be better to convert it into a systematic review and fulfill all the PRISMA checklist items. Please add an abstract. The references are too few. I would suggest expanding the review. (3) Format: 1 table. 47 references were cited, including 10 references published in the last three years. No self-citation. 2 Language evaluation: Grade A and B. Language editing certificate by was not properly provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The conflict-of-interest disclosure was not properly provided, the Copyright License Agreement was provided. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck search and the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: (1) Invited manuscript. (2) Without financial support. (3) Corresponding author has not published articles in BPG. 5 Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions. (2) The "Abstract" section is missing, and the information of authors and corresponding author is missing, please provide all missing parts. (3) The number of references is too small for a review. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Authors would like to thank the Editor for the provided suggestions and for spending precious time on this paper.

We expanded the content and made the manuscript more comprehensive. We expanded both the references and the review as requested. However, it was not in authors' first intent to provide a systematic review of the literature. Moreover, not enough evidences were found in

the literature (in terms of number of studies, and quality and validity of trials) in order to meet PRISMA Checklist Criteria and perform a systematic review of the literature. Authors believe the revision provided in this paper is however a very good contribution to scientific community on this field.

The manuscript was revised by a native language speaker author as requested

We provided the author contributions in the correct section.

We added an Abstract as required

We provided missing information of authors and corresponding authors

We implemented the number of references as requested