

Dear Editor,

I am pleased to resubmit for publication the revised version of ESPS Manuscript NO: 20185 "Promising short-term clinical results of the cementless Oxford phase III medial unicondylar knee prosthesis". I appreciated the constructive criticisms of the editor and the reviewer. I have addressed each of the comments as outlined below.

EDITOR COMMENTS

Comment 1: A short running title of less than 6 words should be provided.

- A short running title is provided

Comment 2: Please offer the postcode! Thank you!

- The postcode is provided

Comment 3: Any article describing a study (basic research, clinical research, and case report) involving human and/or animal subjects is required to have the institutional review board (IRB) name, whether institutional (part of the author(s)' academic/medical institution, such as the Oak Grove Children's Hospital Institutional Review Board) or commercial/independent/private (contracted for-profit organizations, such as the ClinicCare Coalition for Human Rights Institutional Review Board), stated explicitly in the title page. In addition, a copy of any ethics approval document(s)/letter(s) or waiver should be provided to the BPG in PDF format.

- Institutional review board statement was provided.

Comment 4: Any research article describing a study (clinical research and case report) involving humans should contain a statement in the title page clearly stating that all involved persons (subjects or legally authorized representative) gave their informed consent (written or verbal, as appropriate) prior to study inclusion. In general, the BPG requires that any and all details that might disclose the identity of the subjects under study should be omitted or anonymized. In the rare situation that a study participant's identifiable information is crucial to the case presentation, the statement of informed consent is absolutely necessary, unless the participant is deceased. In addition, a copy of any approval document(s)/letter(s) or waiver should be provided to the BPG in PDF format.

- Informed consent statement was provided

Comment 5: Any manuscript describing a study (basic research and clinical research) that used biostatistics must include a statement in the Materials and Methods section affirming that the statistical review of the study was performed by a biomedical statistician. Statistical review is performed before the submission or after peer-review. The author invites an expert in Biomedical Statistics to evaluate the statistical method(s) used in the study, including but not limited to the *t*-test (group or paired comparisons), chi-square test, ridit, probit, logit and regression (linear, curvilinear, or stepwise) modeling, correlation, analysis of variance, and analysis of covariance. The review by the biomedical statistician is conducted with respect to the following

points: (1) Statistical methods are adequately and appropriately described when they are used to verify the results; (2) Whether the statistical techniques are suitable or correct; (3) Only homogeneous data can be averaged. Standard deviations are preferred to standard errors. The number of observations and subjects (n) is given. Losses in observations, such as drop-outs from the study, are reported; (4) Values, such as ED50, LD50 and IC50, have the 95% confidence limits calculated and have been compared by weighted probit modeling (using the functions described by Bliss and Finney); and (5) The word “significantly” is replaced by its synonyms (if it indicates extent) or the P value (if it indicates statistical significance). In addition, a copy of any approval document(s)/letter(s) or waiver should be provided to the BPG in PDF format.

- Statistical review of the study was performed by A. Heneweer MSc.

Comment 6: A conflict-of-interest statement is required for all article and study types. In the interests of transparency and helping reviewers to assess any potential bias in a study's design, interpretation of its results or presentation of its scientific/medical content, the BPG requires all authors of each paper to declare any conflicting interests (including but not limited to commercial, personal, political, intellectual, or religious interests) in the title page that are related to the work submitted for consideration of publication. In addition, reviewers are required to indicate any potential conflicting interests they might have related to any particular paper they are asked to review, and a copy of signed statement should be provided to the BPG in PDF format.

- A conflict-of-interest statement is provided

Comment 7: Basic research and clinical research studies require a data sharing statement. The data sharing statement will be provided in the title page, and will be presented in the following form: Technical appendix, statistical code, and dataset available from the corresponding author at Dryad repository, who will provide a permanent, citable and open-access home for the dataset. In addition, a copy of the signed statement should be provided to the BPG in PDF format.

- Data sharing statement is provided

Comment 8: Please offer the audio core tip, the requirement are as follows: In order to attract readers to read your full-text article, we request that the first author make an audio file describing your final core tip. This audio file will be published online, along with your article. Please submit audio files according to the following specifications: Acceptable file formats: .mp3, .wav, or .aiff. Maximum file size: 10 MB

To achieve the best quality, when saving audio files as an mp3, use a setting of 256 kbps or higher for stereo or 128 kbps or higher for mono. Sampling rate should be either 44.1 kHz or 48 kHz. Bit rate should be either 16 or 24 bit. To avoid audible clipping noise, please make sure that audio levels do not exceed 0 dBFS.

- An audio core tip is provided according to the mentioned requirements.

Comment 9: Please write the comments.

Writing requirements for each subsection

(1) Background

To summarize concisely and accurately the relevant background information so that readers may gain some basic knowledge about your study's relevance and understand its significance for the field as a whole.

(2) Research frontiers

To introduce briefly the current hotspots or important areas in the research field as related to your study.

(3) Innovations and breakthroughs

To summarize and emphasize the differences, particularly the advances, achievements, innovations and breakthroughs, as compared to other related or similar studies in the literature, which will allow the readers to assimilate the major points of your article.

(4) Applications

To summarize the practical applications of your research findings, so that readers may understand the perspectives by which this study will affect the field and future research.

(5) Terminology

To describe concisely and accurately any terms that may not be familiar to the majority of the readers, but which are essential for understanding your article.

- Comments were provided according to the mentioned requirements.

REVIEWER COMMENTS (02897620)

Title and abstract UKP needs to be defined.

- UKP is changed to unicondylar knee prosthesis

Abstract: Clear and concise.

- Thank you for the positive feedback

Introduction: unicondylar knee prosthesis is used in the first line and can be abbreviated at that time in UKP, rather than in the second sentence.

- Unicondylar knee prosthesis is changed to UKP

Methods section, second paragraph. Were the two patients who were deceased, deceased at follow up? This is not clear.

- The sentence is clarified; Of the 103 eligible patients, two patients were deceased at the time of follow-up and one patient refused participation.

Also did the one patient who refused to participate initially consent and then refused and thus was lost to follow up?

- The patient who refused was eligible based upon characteristics, but was not included.

Redo's section Sentence 6, I am unclear what "bended osteoma" means. Otherwise results are clearly presented.

- "bended osteoma" was changed to "a curved osteotome"

Figure 1, does this present mean scores. This should perhaps be stated in the title. It also presents outcomes which have different scales, which makes interpretation a little difficult (eg ROM and VAS scale).

- I changed the figure to separate plots.

Table 1: There is a value for "Follow-up" in the table with a p value. This is follow-up of what?

- This is the follow-up time in months, from the date of surgery until the date of the clinical assessment.

It is unclear what the p value is referring to which is aligned to OA medial, OA lateral, OA patellofemoral. Is it joint space difference? If this is the case, some values presented are zero which makes interpretation difficult and the value of the Chi square test questionable.

- I changed the headings, these were unclear. The p-value refers to the division of Ahlbäck grading between the group cemented and the group cementless UKP.

Language polishing;

Last paragraph of introduction, first sentence "as good as" should be "as well as"

Technique section: First sentence, second line "accept the cementless.." should be "except the cementless..." Second sentence, "Additional" should be "Additionally"

Second paragraph, last sentence "haemarthros" should be "haemarthrosis" Third

paragraph, second sentence "pomp" should be "pump" Fourth sentence,

"prophylaxes" should be "prophylaxis" Second last sentence "physical therapy directly." should be "physical therapy immediately". Clinical and radiological

evaluation section First paragraph, first sentence "shorter" should be "less" First

paragraph, last sentence, "upon 5 degrees specific." should perhaps be "in 5 degree

increments" Results: First paragraph, first line, "Of the patients with an UKP,.. " Third

sentence "accept" should be "except" Discussion: First sentence "want" should be

"wanted" Third paragraph, second last sentence "to little bone" should be "too little

bone" Last sentence, last word "solved" should be "resolved" Sixth paragraph, second

sentence "posterior" should be "posteriorly" Conclusion: Last line "for patients

eligible" should be "for eligible patients" Table 1, "sexed" should be "sex".

Thank you very much for the constructive criticisms and for considering our manuscript for publication.

Best regards,

Karin van Dorp