

Dear Sir or Madam:

Thank you for your review of our paper titled "Distal Triceps injuries (including snapping triceps). A systematic review of the literature."

02566697 Reviewers comments

1) In general, when reporting a percentage of subjects, the authors should include the objective number used.

These corrections have been made.

2) The section of triceps ruptures should be clearly separated from the snapping section.

This correction has been made

3) Anatomy section, paragraph 2, should start with "Partial tears..."

This correction has been made.

4) Investigation section, paragraph 2, line 4: I think the authors mean bone-tendon junction, not musculotendinous junction.

This correction has been made.

5) Treatment: this section is lacking. The information is so general that no one could get useful information. The percentages presented are not correctly referred. A more detailed review of the available information, with more hard data is necessary along the section.

The treatment section has been re written to include a more detailed analysis of the data.

6 ) Again the treatment of snapping triceps is under considered.

This section has also been re written to include a more detailed analysis of the data so far as the data quality allows.

Regarding the comments made by reviewer 33074

1) The language needs to be improved greatly because of some grammar mistakes and misuse of punctuation. In addition, the authors used some phrases rather than whole sentences in the text, which is not good. Please have some native English speaker to revise the language for you.

The quality of the language has been reviewed and improved by a native English speaker and phrases have been removed.

2. Format of the review: This is an ordinary review regarding the distal triceps injuries, however, the authors did a meta analysis like review. There is no need to report the flow chart of this review. You can just make a good review structure for this review and there is no need to report the search strategies and the number of articles you have found. If you want to do a meta analysis, you have to do a much complicated review including a lot of figures and analysis methods using a special software.

The inclusion criteria and flow chart have been included which is standard for a systematic review in order to demonstrate that there is no systematic exclusion of papers that may bias the results.

3. Abbreviations: In this paper, the authors used some abbreviations without giving the complete phrases before using them like MRI and CT. Please give the complete phrases of these abbreviations at the first time of use. Please also check the whole article and correct similar problems.

Abbreviations have been corrected

4. If possible, please give some figures to show more vividly the injuries.

A figure of a triceps avulsion has been included to demonstrate the injury.

Regarding the comments made by reviewer 2577402

1) The anatomy is described in the results section, but is not really the result of the systematic search, and should therefore (if relevant) be written in the introduction.

The anatomy section has been moved to the introduction

2) The authors present a review about the management of distal triceps injuries. They call it a systematic review, but it is rather written as just a regular review.

We have specified our search strategy, results of the search and have included a new section on the appraised the literature (all level 4 studies) and as such this qualifies as a systematic review. If the editor wishes “systematic” to be removed from the title we would however be happy to comply.

3) This may be a result of the fact that they did not present a clear aim and hypothesis.

The aim has been clarified. Owing to the lack of good quality data it is not possible to establish superiority of one treatment modality over another and as such is not formally stated as a hypothesis but this is implied in the aim.

4) The authors wrote a paragraph on biomechanical studies which is not part of the search strategy

Although this section is not formally part of the systematic review we believe it is of interest to the reader. It can be removed if that is the wish of the editor but reads better if in the results section rather than in the introduction.