

Date: November 2, 2021  
Subject: Manuscript NO: 67740

Department of Orthopedic Surgery  
Amsterdam University Medical Centers  
Telephone: +31 20 56 62672

Head of the department:  
Prof. Gino M.M.J. Kerkhoffs

To the Editor-in-Chief of *World Journal of Orthopedics*

Dear Prof. Leigheb,

Thank you for your comments on the manuscript entitled “Can bedside needle arthroscopy of the ankle be an accurate option for intra-articular delivery of injectable agents?”. We greatly appreciate your time and review.

We have tried to revise our manuscript accordingly. A response to the reviewer remarks and overview of modifications to the manuscript are enclosed on the second page of this cover letter. We would like to thank you for your contribution to the quality of the manuscript.

Yours sincerely,  
The authors

**Corresponding author:**

Prof. Gino M.M.J. Kerkhoffs  
Amsterdam UMC, location AMC  
Department of Orthopedic Surgery  
Meibergdreef 9, room K1-207  
1105 AZ Amsterdam  
The Netherlands  
T: +31 20 56 62672  
E: [g.m.kerkhoffs@amsterdamumc.nl](mailto:g.m.kerkhoffs@amsterdamumc.nl)

Author response to reviewer comments		
Reviewer comments	Author response	Author action
<b>Reviewer #1</b>		
<p>There were 3 patients failed to receive the procedure due to technical difficulty within 3 attempts (Page 8, line 224). Regarding other 21 patients who achieved successful intra-articular positioning of the needle arthroscope, how many patients received 2 attempts? How many patients received only one attempt?</p>	<p>The procedure was stopped upon three failed attempts. Unfortunately, the number of attempts was not recorded for each individual patient on the study's case report forms and is hence not part of the study's database. Although in hindsight this would have been interesting additional information, we cannot provide quantitative data on this specific parameter. Qualitatively, the procedure was more difficult in patients suffering from advanced-stage osteoarthritis, and in patients with a history of prior ankle surgery. This difficulty does show in the quantitative parameters as recorded, and is hence reported in the manuscript.</p>	<p>No action.</p>
<p>The authors collected NRS during the procedure, at discharge and during a control visit 2 weeks later. The median NRS at different time points showed significantly decrease with p value &lt; 0.01 (Page 9, line 242-247). Please comment on clinically significant differences for significant differences. Harris JD, Brand JC, Cote MP, Faucett SC, Dhawan A. Research Pearls: The significances of Statistics and Perils of Pooling. Part 1: Clinical Versus Statistical Significance. Arthroscopy. 2017;33(6):1102-12. Specify the number of patients that met MCID or/and PASS for the PROMS.</p>	<p>The number of patients that experienced a MCID in pain was calculated and reported.</p>	<p>Lines 209 – 212: In case of a statistically significant difference in PROMS between discharge and follow-up, the number of patients that met the threshold for a minimal clinically important difference (MCID) was calculated[11]. For the NRS of pain, this MCID was set a minimal difference of three points on the 0 – 10 scale[12]. Line 251: In six patients, pain in rest decreased with at least three points (MCID) on the NRS scale Line 253: In seven patients, pain during walking decreased with at least three points (MCID) on the NRS scale.</p>
<p>Page 12 line 318-321. Since this study is not focused on</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>The respective lines were removed.</p>

learning curve of bedside needle arthroscopy, I suggest to move out of these 2 sentences so that this section only includes actual limitations of the study		
<b>Science editor</b>		
There are 4 self-cited references. The self-referencing rates should be less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations.	Agreed	References 2, 7 and (as in the manuscript of the first submission) were removed. One self-citation that is closely related to the topic remains (reference 6 in the revised manuscript).
The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions.	Agreed	An author contributions section was added under Footnotes (from line 466).
The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).	Agreed	The approved and signed grant application form was provided.
The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.	Agreed	Provided as suggested.
The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.	Agreed	Article highlights were added as suggested, at the end of the main text (from line 342).

