

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear authors, Thank you for the privilege of reviewing your manuscript. You describe a systematic review of outcomes and complications of endoscopic fasciotomy to release exertional compartment syndrome in adults. I suggest to provide CI for your systematic review results. In conclusion please replace "favorable outcomes" by "favorable short and mid term outcomes."

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

Regarding the CI comment, our analysis was basic descriptive analysis without any p-values measured due to the nature of the studied available in the literature and included in our systematic review.

Therefore, CI is not applicable. CI would be used in more advanced statistics.

For the suggestion regarding the conclusion, the change was made in the conclusion of the abstract and the main text as advised.

(1) Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a systematic review of the endoscopic fasciotomy for chronic exertional compartment syndrome of the forearm. The topic is within the scope of the WJO. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors describe a systematic review of outcomes and complications of endoscopic fasciotomy to release exertional compartment syndrome in adults. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 1 figure. A total of 23 references are cited, including 2 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. The authors are from Canada. 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 unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJO. 5 Issues raised:

(1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions.

RESPONSE: Added.

(2) 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: Original PowerPoint file submitted with the revised manuscript.

(3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

RESPONSE: Done.

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

RESPONSE: Done. Added after the conclusion.

(5) Authors should always cite references that are relevant to their study. Please check and remove any references that not relevant to this study.

RESPONSE: Checked. All references we cited are relevant to our study and should help the readers understand the topic well.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

(2) Editorial office director:

(3) 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.

7 COPYRIGHT LICENSE AGREEMENT

Please click and download the Copyright License Agreement Form. Subsequently, a PDF (scanned) version of the Copyright License Agreement Form that has been signed by all authors should be uploaded to the file destination of 'Copyright License Agreement'.