

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/joma-21-22>

Reviewer A

This careful review matches the experience of experienced clinicians. For those with less, important information is discussed. The paper offers a timely addition to the literature.

Reply: Thank you for your constructive and reasonable feedback.

Changes in the text: N/A

Reviewer B

This paper reviews the literature on applications for liposomal bupivacaine (LB) in oral and maxillofacial surgery. This is an important topic in the field because use is increasing. The paper is well-written and easy to read.

The paper's strongest features are the Introduction and the Narrative. The authors do a very good job of describing LB and its history. They present the published research well, describing key findings, contradictions, and need for future research.

However, the Methods section needs considerably more detail:

1. Precisely list the databases used. The authors state, "databases such as PubMed, the Cochrane Library, and clinicaltrials.gov." Did they actually use these databases or just databases like that. "Such as" is too ambiguous a term. Were others used besides these three? State exactly which databases were used.

Reply: Thank you for your feedback

Changes in the text: page 4, line 19 removed the words "such as."

2. The authors state they searched "using keywords". Were these MeSH terms? Was the search only in the keyword category of the databases? Did they also search for these words in the title, abstract, main text, or other locations? This should all be explained to the reader in detail so they can be assured that the search was comprehensive. Include the exact search string(s). See example in Appendix 1 of Farooqi 2015, PMID 26698003.

Reply: Thank you for your feedback. We hope you find our update satisfactory.

Changes in the text: We have updated the methods section with in-depth explanation as to the search that was conducted located on page 4 line 20-23, page 5 line 1-9.

3. Page 4, line 22, the authors state “all articles available.” Please state the actual number of articles.

Reply: Thank you for your feedback.

Changes in the text: Updated to include the actual number of articles on page 5 line 2 and line 5.

Please add a table that lists all the included articles, perhaps at the end of the Narrative section or in an appendix. See examples in Table 2 of Gibson 2011, PMID 21972457 or Table 1 of the Farooqi article mentioned above. This would be a valuable addition for the reader.

Page 10, full paragraph on cost – the discussion here misses the opportunity to circle back to the non-financial costs of the opioid crisis. The authors do a good job of explaining the financial costs of LB here and comparing it to other medical costs (PT sessions, length of hospital stay, etc.). They highlight Hyland’s paper, that determined there isn’t a cost benefit of LB compared to standard of care. However, since this is the discussion section, there is the opportunity here to return to how financial costs compare to other costs of opioid use. The opioid crisis is nicely explained in the Introduction; this is the place to discuss the financial costs of LB vs it’s non-financial benefits.

Reply: Thank you for your feedback. We have “circled back” to the opioid crisis with the addition of the last few sentences.

Changes in the text: Updated to include tie back into the opioid crisis page 11 line 2-5.

Last, some minor typos:

1. Page 4, line 1, change “in to” to “into”.

Reply: Thank you for this feedback

Changes in the text: Fixed type page 4 line 1.

2. Page 7, line 10, change “The” to “There”.

Reply: Thank you for this feedback

Changes in the text: Fixed typo page 7 line 18 (new line number with additions elsewhere).