

Dr Aditya Borakati
 Royal Free Hospital
 Pond Street
 London
 NW3 2QG
 United Kingdom
 a.borakati@doctors.org.uk

World Journal of Orthopaedics
 7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite 160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
 Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
 E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
 https://www.wjgnet.com

Dear Sir/Madam,

Many thanks for your time in thoroughly reviewing our manuscript and for your thoughtful comments,

Our responses are outlined below:

1) Reviewer's code: 02706155

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> General
	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

As the authors claimed that Day case total shoulder arthroplasty (TSA) is a novel approach, we need these data accumulation to gather our experience.

We are grateful for the reviewer's positive comments and agree this is a novel approach which requires greater coverage in the literature.

2) Reviewer's code: 03069318

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
--------------------	------------------	------------	--------------------------

<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good		<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the topic of the manuscript:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Introduction Appropriate Line 21-24. An aim should be described.

This has been clarified and aims more clearly described in the main text.

Methods A power analysis is important to determine sample size.

We have calculated the power of our study post-hoc.

Patient reported outcomes and functional assessment outcomes are important for clinical studies. A 3 month follow up is rather short for ROM outcome The primary outcome being the ROM is rather clinical insignificant. I would recommend to focus on the complications and safety as a primary outcome given the short follow up period.

We agree with these comments and have identified them as limitations in the discussion. We were unable to get patient reported outcomes as a retrospective study. We believe that the range of motion may give a rough idea of functional outcomes in the absence of formal functional assessments and have included them to avoid no mention of any functional indicators at all.

Results Appropriate Power calculation based on difference only in abduction seems problematic. Discussion Appropriate

Our power calculation is post-hoc in any case and simply to help inform future prospective and randomised studies. As a retrospective study based on the maximum available data at our centre we did not feel power calculations were appropriate. Ideally in a prospective study we would have conducted an a-priori power calculation.

Best regards,



Dr Aditya Borakati