

Answering Reviewers

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

I am a corresponding author of this article, "Accuracy of Rotator Cuff Reparability Score". All the authors approved this manuscript as an honest work without outside funding or grant supports.

With this cover letter, we submit the revised manuscript entitled, "Accuracy of Rotator Cuff Reparability Score" for publication in the World Journal of Orthopedics. We would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their careful and constructive reviews. Based on the comments from the editors and reviewers, we really appreciate your effort. Your suggestions are beneficial for our manuscript. We have made changes to the manuscript, which are detailed below.

Reviewer #1: it is well written paper but the small sample size and retrospective nature are the limitations that must be highlighted in the paper sample size calculation not mentioned

Respond: Thank you for your thoughtful comment, we have revised the manuscript and added the limitations about the retrospective nature and small sample size.

Reviewer #2: GOOD paper well written good number of patients included this was mentioned as retrospective study the data regarding the arthroscopic measurements were done by a probe - was all the information obtained from the records were the measurements done through 1 or 2 portals (to assess both dimensions)- mention the standard technique used for all patients was the arthroscopic capsular release done for all patients what were the indications please mention the clinical and functional outcome and the duration of follow up This would be very useful and the discussion has to be modified accordingly.

Respond: We appreciated your suggestion, but our goal was to determine the factors that influence the reparability of the torn rotator cuff. We did not collect clinical outcomes or PROs in this cohort. We agree with you that the clinical outcome and follow-up should be examined at further. This limitation has been included in our manuscript.

Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Orthopedics, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures

showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". 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. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e., generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Respond: We thank the Company Editor-in-Chief for the positive comments. We have made changes in accordance with the comments.

Finally, the manuscript has been carefully reviewed by an experienced editor whose first language is English and who specializes in editing papers written by scientists whose native language is not English.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.
Sincerely,

Thun Itthipanichpong, M.D.
Department of Orthopaedics, Faculty of Medicine, Chulalongkorn University, King Chulalongkorn Memorial Hospital, Bangkok, Thailand.
Email: thun.i@chula.ac.th