

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear authors! After reviewing your manuscript, I have come to the following conclusion: The manuscript contains some important information about your study, but is overall lacking in detail. The introduction to the topic is far too short and the actual problem you want to investigate is not sufficiently presented.

- Response: Thank you for your comment. The introduction section has been extended as requested with emphasis on the research question and why it is relevant.

The description of the method lacks specific information on recruitment, the exact procedure for conducting the study and an initial categorization of the patients.

- Response: The method section has been amended accordingly. The recruitment method, detailed description of the study procedures, tourniquet application has been described as well as the initial categorisation of the patients.

The presentation of the results also lacks important information such as a complete description of the patient population (age, gender, previous illnesses, etc.).

- Response: The results section has been amended to include age, gender and previous illnesses as requested with multivariate regression analysis to the 24 hour VAS as a subgroup analysis

Overall, the discussion is presented in an acceptable manner. I therefore cannot recommend publication in the present form. A complete revision of the manuscript is necessary. Best regards! Your reviewer

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: 1: The study lacks clarity in its classification, merely indicating a prospective design. However, the precise nature – whether cross-sectional, cohort, or descriptive – is not explicitly stated.

- Response: This has been highlighted in the introduction section, page 4 line 25 as a prospective cohort study

2: In the context of being a prospective study, was there a preregistered protocol?

- Response: This has been highlighted in page 5 line 4 in the introduction section.

3: Were there missing patient attrition or non-response during the study? If so, elucidate the details and reasons for withdrawal to enhance transparency.

- Response: Thank you for your comment. None of the patients were lost to follow-up and this has been highlighted in the results section, page 6 line 16.

4: The absence of Table 1 detailing demographic characteristics raises concerns. A comprehensive description of patient demographics, encompassing age, gender, and relevant clinical parameters, is imperative. 5: Can the correlation between the observed outcomes and patient-specific attributes, such as age, be quantified? Elaborating on the

potential influence of individual characteristics on therapeutic response would fortify the study's depth.

- Response: This has been added in the results section and in table 1.