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Comments to the Author

The authors evaluated to determine the efficacy of cFNB compared with the sFNB group and whether cFNB is a superior postoperative pain management modality in patients who had undergone TKA. Eight randomized controlled trials (N=626) that compared the efficacy of cFNB with sFNB were included. The primary outcome domains consist of visual analog scale (VAS) score at postoperative 24 and 48 hours. The secondary outcome domains include opioid consumption, length of hospital stay and incidence of nausea. The results showed that patients might benefit from a continuous femoral nerve block with regards to a reduced consumption of opioids in the early postoperative period. However, we did not find a clinically significant difference in pain scores at different time points between the cFNB and sFNB group.

There are some interesting things in this paper. However, there are several major concerns with the paper that limit the enthusiasm for the findings and raise questions about the interpretation and novelty of the findings.

These concerns are outlined below

1. The introduction is long and should be summarized specifically.

2. P10, "The analysis showed a significantly lower VAS score at 24 hours in the cFNB group in comparison with the sFNB group (SMD: -0.277; 95% CI -0.503 to -0.05; heterogeneity: I²=35.181; Fig. 2). VAS score at 24 hours in the cFNB and sFNB group were 47.1mm and 47.6mm, respectively" I do not agree with this data. I think there is no difference of VAS score at 24 h.

3. Show the VAS data at 48h respectively. The same applies to the amount of opioid.

4. The discussion is also a list of results, please explain in detail. Please explain concretely and concisely what you are guided from the results about the discussion. The data is presented in the discussion, and the results and the discussion are intermingled.

5. "Further studies should investigate the association of cFNB and sFNB postoperative quadriceps strength and to provide more information to formulate a fall prevention strategy." This paper is a meta-analysis and the work is of great interest to readers. If possible, include the data in this paper.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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