

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jss-23-14>

Reviewer Comments

I have reviewed the revised manuscript. Although I applaud the authors for their tenacity, the manuscript leaves much to be desired.

The intent of the manuscript is to provide a review of the evidence for the use of erector spinae plane (ESP) blocks for outpatient spine surgery. However, the manuscript does not do the topic justice, mostly because it is not a complete review based on the search terms and the authors seem to pick and choose what studies to include instead of offering an unbiased review. The authors were made aware in the first round of reviews. In this revised manuscript, the authors claim they have updated their manuscript, but this does not appear to be true.

Editorial Note: The editorial office understand the nature of potential bias of a narrative review (not a systematic review). Therefore, the authors could state in the section-limitation that the content should be read with caution as the nature of a narrative review.

There are also many statements regarding anesthesia that are not true and reflect limited insight. The author's claim that "the [multimodal analgesic] regiment was consistent between the groups" in the summarizing table, is not only false but reflects the general lack of understanding and appreciation of the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of various analgesic medications. For example, the treatment of remifentanyl is not the same as sufentanyl, particularly in terms of potency and context-sensitive half-life which would undoubtedly affect postoperative and overall opioid consumption and pain perception. Outside of needing a grammatical overhaul, the results section is severely missing an analysis of the quality of the papers included for review and only offers no new statistical analyses of the included papers. The discussion section also offers very little substantial reflection.

Reply: Hello and thank you for your constructive comments. We feel like we have now addressed all the points in the document. If you could also offer up what else you would like to hear in the discussions as we have added to it as much as we can from a review article we believe. We also included in limitations in accordance with the "editorial note" that this is narrative review with limitations and not a systematic review. In addition, we have addressed the grammar with the edits disclosed in the document attached below. There is insufficient outpatient studies I believe to include those but I had them in the original document and can add those parts back in if you think that would suffice. Thank you for your time and help.