

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

ESPS Manuscript NO: 29671

Reporting rotator cuff tears on magnetic resonance arthrography using the Snyder's arthroscopic classification

Reviewer 02577402

We thank the reviewer for her/his appreciation and fruitful comments.

1. *"The language needs to be improved because of some grammar mistakes and mistyping."*
Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. We checked the manuscript for grammar mistakes and mistyping errors, thus modifying it when necessary.
2. *"Citation of figures: In the text, the figures should be cited in the order the figures appeared in the text."*
Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. Figures were checked and citation order was corrected according to how they appear in the manuscript.
3. *"The authors did not give the complete phrase of MRI before using the abbreviation MRI."*
Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. "MRI" was first introduced as a complete phrase (Magnetic Resonance Imaging) and subsequently used as an acronym.
4. *"Tables 4-6: IN these tables, the authors only pointed out reader 1. What about reader 2? Is there any difference between the scores given by reader 2 and the reference standards? Please explain. Also, please give the definition of A and B in these tables"*
Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. First we clarify that reader 1 is the more experienced one. For analysis purposes, data obtained by the most experienced reader (reader 1) were used. Thus, we just included reader 1 in the table for summary purposes. This was now highlighted and specified in the text and in the table captions. We also gave the definition of A and B where missing.
5. *"In the CONCLUSION in both the abstract and in the text, the tense should be present tense rather than the past tense".*
Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. Both tense were corrected.

Reviewer 02346872

We thank the reviewer for her/his appreciation and fruitful comments.

1. *"There are not a structural abstract. "*
Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. Abstract was added according to author's manuscript instructions.
2. *"Arthroscopy was performed by several orthopedic surgeons with different experience in RCTs repair. Thus, certain degree of variability in RCTs scoring at the reference standard may be expected".*
Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. We acknowledge this and we already stated that in the limitations, at the end of the study. Nevertheless, we added a small sentence to highlight this even more.

3. *"The delay between MRA and arthroscopy limited the reliability of the reference standard"*

Re: We thank the reviewer for her/his comment. Also for this point, we acknowledge that this represent a limitation, and we already stated at the end of the study. As for the previous limitation, we slightly modified the already present sentence to highlight this even more.