

Comments to Authors

Dear Editor thank you for your comments of those of the reviewers we shall use them to improve the article.

Reviewer 1

Well written manuscript that discusses important issues

Reviewer 2

Accepted-interesting read

Reviewer 3

*The **title** is referring directly to the problem at hand. The **abstract** is sufficient. **Key words** reflect the focus of the manuscript. **Introduction** is extensible and clear.*

***Material and Methods** are described under the following subchapters: [Intellectual property, Patent, Patent Expiry and financial Sequelae, Generic Orthopaedic Implants, Approval of Generic Devices, Point of Entry of Generic Implants into Healthcare Systems: Some old or Brand New?, Patent Trolls and The Abuse of, Intellectual Property Protection].*

Although you have conducted an extensive search and you are describing your work as review, you are not indicating what studies you are evaluated, neither you mention criteria of acceptance or exclusion used.

The nature of the review is a narrative view hence as such there were no exclusions. The aim was to inform regarding patents, intellectual property and approval of arthroplasty implants. Hence any authoritative article provided the requisite information was included.

***Results** are missing as a separate chapter.*

***Discussion** also is missing as a separate chapter, although part of it is included to the various subchapters,*

We intentionally elected to assimilate the results, discussion and to some extent the conclusion in the article to facilitate the intelligibility, palatability and fluidity of the piece. The alternative would be to disconnect the results from the conclusion for each component of the review. In such as instance it would not be immediately apparent to the reader the foundation of each discussion. The reader may then have to constantly refer to the results thereby comprising the impact of the piece

***Conclusions** “[...]. However cost saving cannot come at the expense of patient safety. [...].The emergence of equivalent implants may herald a commercial renaissance for global healthcare [...].”*

Limitations *Although, in the submitted manuscript there is a multitude of citations for generic orthopaedic implants, discussion and results are not provided as a whole in separate chapters but only in the various subchapters.*

We elected to this for clarity

The impression that advertising a company is included weakens the scientific value of the present work. This is the limitation of the submitted manuscript, apart from the deviation from the established writing structure.

Thank you for this comment. It was at the forefront of our minds the importance of avoiding the promotion of any product or manufacturers. There is no intention to advertise or endorse any product or implant. We merely present neutral facts. If there are few manufacturers of imitation implants, we can only discuss these few. In so doing we had to present positive as well as negative data pertaining to these products. After much thought, we felt it would be inappropriate to present only the failings of imitation implant manufacturers or to not discuss them at all.

References *are cited appropriately the latest references while the submitted manuscript is supported by 57 references.*

The submitted manuscript is aiming to explore patents and their repercussions for musculoskeletal care.

Advertising a company that produces generic implants it is not within physician's scientific interest. Scientific community's interest is to ensure that the quality of the generic implants remains high, accessible and continuous.

Thank you for this comment. It was at the forefront of our minds the importance of avoiding the promotion of any product or manufacturers. There is no intention to advertise or endorse any product or implant. We merely present neutral facts. If there are few manufacturers of imitation implants, we can only discuss these few. In so doing we had to present positive as well as negative data pertaining to these products. After much thought , we felt it would be inappropriate to present only the failings of imitation implant manufacturers or to not discuss them at all.