

## ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Dear Editor,

RE: Manuscript # 26716-8-4 entitled ""Meniscal" scar as a landmark for the joint line in revision total knee replacement"

We would be grateful if you would accept this revised manuscript for consideration for publication. The manuscript has been revised taking into account the suggested alterations and comments made by the reviewers. We have ordered our responses to the reviewers in the tables below to help identify the changes.

	<b>Reviewer 1 Comments</b>	<b>Authors' Response and Corrections</b>
	A simple and interesting paper.	We thank the reviewer for their comments.
1	A general comment; a comma should not proceed the word AND as far as I am aware. This appears a multitude of times throughout the text and should be corrected.	This has been corrected in the text.
2	A few corrections listed below: grammatical error line 7 first paragraph page 1 'thicker tibial insert' (no A) typo second paragraph page 1; patellA (prior to ref [7]) nonsensical; second sentence under Materials and Methods nonsensical; fourth sentence under Materials and Methods grammar; penultimate sentence under material and methods 'inflammation AND degeneration' grammar: second sentence penultimate paragraph entire text 'meniscII' typo: penultimate paragraph of entire text, 6th line from the end of paragraph 'synthetic'	We thank the reviewer for identifying these mistakes. Corrections have been made.
3	First line of penultimate paragraph of article 'scar INCREASINGLY being used...' is this evidence based? If so can this statement be supported by the literature? I certainly do not use it but maybe I should?	Relevant references have been added.

	<b>Reviewer 2 Comments</b>	<b>Authors' Review and Corrections</b>
	Please qualify this as a pilot study. You need to describe how it was assessed preopertaively that the joint line had been altered.	The relevant information has been added to the paper.

	<b>Reviewer 3 Comments</b>	<b>Authors' Review and Corrections</b>
--	----------------------------	--

	The present study described the 'meniscal' scar as one of many landmarks used to identify the native joint line. Could the authors compare transepicondylar axis and the 'meniscal' scar at the time of revision knee arthroplasty?	The various landmarks used to identify the joint line have been outlined and discussed.
--	---	---

	<b>Reviewer 4 Comments</b>	<b>Authors' Review and Corrections</b>
	Very well written paper but you must modify the purpose to be more concordant with the aim of the study: evaluate the accuracy of meniscal scare as landmark of joint line. In the conclusion, you must answer to this question saying that considering the meniscal scare as landmark of line joint is not accurate. You have a small series, so results must be taken with caution.	We thank the reviewer for their comments. The paper has been revised to take account of these comments.

We hope that the above changes are satisfactory. We thank the reviewer for their input as we believe the paper has been improved as a result of it. Thank you.

Kind regards

Wasim Khan  
Division of Trauma and Orthopaedics  
University of Cambridge  
Addenbrooke's Hospital  
Cambridge  
CB2 2QQ  
UK

Tel: 0044 (0) 7791 025554

E-mail: [wasimkhan@doctors.org.uk](mailto:wasimkhan@doctors.org.uk)