

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Meta-analysis of factors influencing anterior knee pain after total knee arthroplasty" (Manuscript NO.: 89243, Meta-Analysis). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval.

Revised portion are marked in yellow in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a manuscript of meta-analysis detailing the effect of certain arthroplasty procedure on post operative anterior knee pain. The title should be further elaborated as this manuscript only look at few of the factors (patella resurfacing, circumpatellar denervation, fixed or mobile bearing implant, lateral retinacular release, freehand or guided cut) while other factors were not discussed here for example quadriceps elasticity, patella position pre and post op and etc. The conclusion need to be elaborated as the results are found from statistical analysis. Majority of the conclusions have been known in previous studies. The statistical analysis is good however the authors need to explain why such tests is done and how is the findings of this manuscript different from the others.

Response to comment:

- Because only randomized controlled trials were included in our study, we did not include relevant studies on factors such as quadriceps elasticity, patella position pre and post op and etc. In this revision, we have added a brief discussion of other factors.
- We have elaborated on our conclusions.
- We have explained why such tests is done and how is the findings of this manuscript different from the others.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Dear authors: First of all, I would like to congratulate you on the great research work carried out. It seems to me to be a successful topic and a very well carried out meta-analysis with all the necessary methodological aspects. The results are very well presented and detailed by variables studied. Regarding the introduction, I must say that it is very basic and the first lines do not have references, so I invite you to add to this first section of the text. As for the discussion of the manuscript, it seems to me a section that could be subject to significant improvement, as there are numerous articles with similar themes and should be related to the existing bibliography. Furthermore, in

this section they should introduce the limitations of their study. Finally, I suggest a standardised flow chart for this type of study and not one of your own elaboration. Modify these small sections and you will improve the study. Regards

Response to comment:

- We added a reference to the first line.
- As for the discussion of the manuscript, we have added some content to improve it.
And we have introduced the limitations of our study.
- We added a standardised flow chart for this type of study.