Response letter for resubmission

Name of journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

Manuscript NO.: 32869

Column: Observational Study

Title: Upper extremity disorders in heavy industry workers in Greece

Authors: Thomaella Tsouvaltzidou, Evangelos Alexopoulos, Ioannis Fragkakis and Eleni Jelastopulu

Reviewer code: 00646701

Dear Editor, dear reviewers,

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript. An Institutional review board statement and a Data sharing statement have been added and signed, along with an Audio core tip. The Conflict-of-interest statement and the Informed consent statement have already been included in the text of the manuscript, as well as more details about the address of the corresponding author. Regarding the language editing process, there should be no need to provide a language editing certificate since two of the authors of the manuscript have a Proficiency Degree in English. Additionally, the updated version of the manuscript has been revised by a Native English speaker.

Response to the reviewer's comments:

Overall, I found this manuscript to be well-written. The introduction and purpose statement were appropriate. The methods were clearly described. Overall, presentation of the results were appropriate and conclusions appear to be appropriate given the data collected and analysis conducted.

Reply to the reviewer: We thank the reviewer for his kind comments.

Abstract & Methods Please confirm the number of study participants as there appears to be a discrepancy in numbers.

Reply to the reviewer: We have changed the number in the Materials section to 802 participants.

Introduction The purpose statement, while appropriate, requires some revision to increase clarity. Please consider revising to read…probably should read that the study was conducted "to analyze disability….and to identify relationships between movement restrictions…"

Reply to the reviewer: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion and revised the purpose statement accordingly.

Methods When discussing your statistical analyses you note a p-value of 0.05. Given the number of analyses was there any consideration given to adjusting the p-value. If not, please provide some rationale.

Reply to the reviewer: We didn't perform multiple analyses, therefore we didn't consider there was any need to adjust the p-value.

Results On page 7, following table 1 the sentence should read "Comparing the mean values, the work category scores were slightly lower than the other two, with a 1.704 mean value (Table 2)."

Reply to the reviewer: The sentence has been changed accordingly.

In addition to providing the regression tables, please provide the regression equations that were derived from your analyses to facilitate the usefulness of this information for the readers.

Reply to the reviewer: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We didn't provide the regression equations because we did not think they would offer any additional information to the readers. We could however include the output of the regression analyses as a supplement.

Discussion In the second paragraph of this section there is a typographical error. I believe you are indicating that participants "denied" any restrictions.

Reply to the reviewer: The typographical error has been corrected.

Third paragraph, the sentence should read, "Especially given certain…"

Reply to the reviewer: The sentence has been revised as "Especially given certain specialties in the heavy industry sector involve great strain of the joints of the upper extremities, and in combination with the reduced stamina and osteoarthretic lesions that accompany older age, there should be a statistically significant association with the final score of the work QD."

Could you please expand on your discussion associated with symptoms, work ability and productivity. Additionally, in the paragraph that follows, could you please further elaborate on your discussion of the findings associated with education and the other sections of the QD. It is indeed interesting that this association did not continue with the other sections of the detail. Please provide further discussion and possible explanation for these results.

Reply to the reviewer: We thank the reviewer for these suggestions. The Discussion section has been revised and highlighted in the manuscript.

Thank you very much again and best regards,

Dr. Eleni Jelastopulu
Professor of Public Health
School of Medicine, University of Patras
26500 Rio Patras
Phone: +30 2610 969878
Fax: +30 2610 991606
Cell: +30 6977624636

email: jelasto@upatras.gr
ejela@yahoo.de