

Respected Sir

We would like to thank the reviewers for taking out their precious time for reviewing this manuscript and for their valuable comments. We have tried to answer all the queries of the reviewers as under.

Response to reviewer's comments

1. Reviewed by 03070938

First of all, I was greatly appreciated for giving me an opportunity of reviewing this manuscript of "Computerized Tomography based 'Patient Specific Blocks' improve postoperative mechanical alignment in primary Total Knee Arthroplasty," an informative study about accuracy of revision surgery for total knee arthroplasty (TKA). General: This manuscript is well organized, and the results are acceptable.

1. Abstract: 1. Abbreviation "PSI" has a problem (not mentioned). :

Response – We have changed the abbreviation PSI and have replaced it with patient specific blocks (PSB). The various abbreviations which have been used have also been mentioned along with their full forms in the text.

2. Please consider following choices. Core tip: "CT based patient specific instruments (PSI) can help restore the mechanical axis of the patients undergoing primary total knee replacement. Core tip: "CT based PSB can help restore the mechanical axis of the patients undergoing primary total knee replacement. Instead of: Core tip: CT based PSI can help restore the mechanical axis of the patients undergoing primary total knee replacement.

Response – The changes in the core tip have been exactly as advised by the reviewer.

3. Last sentence has a problem. This study proved that the CT based PSI helped in accurate restoration of the mechanical axis, and suggested the possibility that the CT based PSI can decrease the rates of revision after TKA. Therefore. Please consider a following choice. CT based PSI holds promise to help in accurate restoration of the mechanical axis and might decrease the rates of revision after TKA. Instead of: CT based PSI holds promise and may help in accurate restoration of the mechanical axis and to decrease the rates of revision after total knee replacement.

Response – We have changed the last sentence as advised by the reviewer.

Introduction: Appropriate Material and Methods: Appropriate

4. Results 1. Figure 5 is unnecessary. Please consider deletion (Otherwise this figure contains a possibility that the misleading "no significant difference")

Response - Figure 5 has been deleted.

2. You should have considered a statistical analysis about outlier between the 2 groups. I checked, and a significant difference was detected. Please consider a following choice. In group 1 there were 7 outliers while in group 2, there were 17 outliers (Figure – 5, 6). Thus, there was also increase in outliers in group 2 compared to group 1. There was a significant difference in outliers achieved in PSI (group 1) compared to CI (group 2) with p-value = 0.0147. Instead of In group 1 there were 7 outliers

while in group 2, there were 17 outliers (Figure – 6, 7). Thus, there was also increase in outliers in group 2 compared to group 1.

Response – The result has been changed as advised by the reviewer. The language of the results has been altered as advised by the reviewer.

Discussion Appropriate

Figure 1. As I mentioned before (Result), please consider deletion of figure 5.

Response – Figure 5 has been deleted.

2. The scales of vertical axis are different between Figure 6 and 7.

Response – The scales of Figure 6 and Figure 7 have been changed as advised and are now same.

Auxiliary dashed lines are expected to understand outlier. JPEG files are attached. Figure 5 Figure 6
References No 4 and 23 references are the same.

Response – Auxiliary lines have been added in both the figures.

The reference no. 23 has been deleted and the numbering of the remaining references has been changed. The reference numbers have also been altered in the manuscript.

We would again like to thank the reviewers for their kind comments.

Regards

Dr Vipul Vijay

Corresponding author