

#Reviewer ID 2741591

Reviewer comment

The methodology is lengthy and should be better wrapped up. English language needs polishing. There is over using of the phrases like ‘we’ and ‘our’; better use indirect speech.

Author reply: Thank you for valuable suggestion. We edited the lengthy expression and direct speech.

#Reviewer ID 2708249

Reviewer comment

1 Title. OK 2 Abstract. OK

3 Key words. Not included. Please fix

Author reply: We added five keywords in title page.

4 Background. More details can be added regarding the availability of MRI compared to other imaging systems (X-rays, etc.)

Author reply: Thank you for valuable suggestion. We added the comment regarding the availability of MRI in Background section.

5 Methods. More details can be added. As mentioned, 42 knees underwent MRI with 1.5T, and 97 knees with 3T might include bias in the obtained results. To avoid difference in MRI examination and a potential impact on the results, correlations can also be studied inside each group. For a better measure, why not to use more than 3 points to measure the thickness of Hoffa’s synovitis?

Author reply: We analyzed the correlation with MOAKS and syonvitis separately, and edited table three and four. We use three points to measure the thickness of Hoffa’s synovitis because it will be more complicated and less useful to choose more points.

6 Results. OK 7 Discussion. OK

8 Illustrations and tables. Figures 2 and 3 are not that clear. They need more legends.

Author reply: Thank you for valuable suggestion. We edited the figure legend.

9 Biostatistics. OK 10 Units. OK

11 References. References 7, 8 and 9 are not so recent as mentioned in the text. Please fix.

Author reply: It is true that these papers were not so recent, so we edited the article.

12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript is well written
13 Research methods and reporting. Please check the manuscript to meet the journal
guidelines 14 Ethics statements. OK