

Mr Peter R Loughenbury MSc FRCS (Tr & Orth),  
National Spine Fellow,  
Department of Neurosciences,  
Leeds General Infirmary,  
Great George Street,  
Leeds  
LS1 3EX  
United Kingdom.  
[p.loughenbury@nhs.net](mailto:p.loughenbury@nhs.net)  
Telephone: 0113 2432799

Dear Sir/Madam

Thank you for considering our article entitled ‘The benefits of the use of blood conservation in scoliosis surgery’ for publication in the *World Journal of Orthopaedics*. We have been through the reviewers’ comments and welcome their input and efforts to improve the quality of the article. I will answer each review in turn.

**Reviewer 00364821**

“The paper is in my opinion ready for publication and can be published as it is. It fulfils both methodological, and technical criteria: language, edition, appropriate selection and use of references, clear and well defined research questions, sound discussion, with a comment on the paper’s weaknesses (typical for retrospective analyses).”

**Reply:** Many thanks for the feedback. We have tried to identify all the strengths and weaknesses of the article and to highlight its main message.

**Reviewer 003510070**

“The manuscript suffers from language problems.”

**Reply:** Thank you for your comments. We have been through the manuscript again to check for any spelling or grammatical errors. Any that were identified have been changed in the revised manuscript. We have also had the article proof read by two other members of our unit who were not involved in the study. We hope any language problems are now corrected.

**Reviewer 02444787**

“I wonder if there is any difference between primary and revisions cases. I doubt the difference between single and combined approaches. Otherwise it is well-designed study.”

**Reply:** There were only five revision cases and with such a small number we decided not to include this analysis in the manuscript in order to keep it succinct. There was no difference when comparing revision and primary procedures. We agree it is important to mention this and have included a statement to this effect on page 9

paragraph 4. We are also unsure about the effect of single or combined approaches but recognise this may be a reason for altered transfusion requirements and have tried to explain this in the discussion. Thank you for your positive feedback and comments.

We hope you the revised manuscript answers the comments of the reviewers and look forward to hearing the final outcome.

Many thanks

Mr Peter R Loughenbury MSc FRCS (Tr & Orth)  
National Spine Fellow  
Leeds General Infirmary