

To the Editorial Board of Baishideng Publishing Group Inc.

Thank you for considering the revised version of our manuscript (version 2), titled “An observational study of a new modular femoral revision system” (no. 52602), as an observational study for publication in World Journal of Orthopedics.

We thank the reviewers for pointing out some important clarifying modifications needed in the manuscript. We found the comments very helpful and constructive. We have addressed all the changes recommended and are confident that the new version of the manuscript is easier to understand and has a more fluent scientific discourse.

To respond to the Editor’s requests, we added x-rays, corrected the language and elaborated on the specifics pointed out by the reviewers, to make the manuscript more understandable and easier to read.

Additionally, the explanation of what we have changed in response to the reviewers’ concerns is given point by point in the following pages. We have submitted a revised version of our manuscript with the changes highlighted together with the documents related to this manuscript.

We hope that these changes fulfil the requirements to make the manuscript acceptable for publication in World Journal of Orthopedics.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely

Dr. Karen Dyreborg

On behalf of the authors

Corresponding author:

Dr. Karen Dyreborg, Rigshospitalet, Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Blegdamsvej 9, 2100 Copenhagen East, Denmark

Tel: +4528918555; Email: karendyreborg@hotmail.com

Reviewer 1

Thank you for your expert comments. Below is described the revisions we made.

First comment:

Need minor grammar checks.

We went through the text and corrected the grammar and some of the sentences.

Second comment:

Add some features about cup and bearing surfaces in the description.

We added: "The cup was changed only if it was loose, or in cases of polywear. The revision implant was an uncemented cup with a surface of trabecular metal with a poly liner. Accordingly, all patients had a metal-on-poly bearing".

Third comment:

Add some evaluation about the choice of the different stems It would be helpful to describe the reconstruction of the biomechanical parameters (offset, leg length), as it is one of the most important reason for choosing modular stem instead of single taper stem. It would be also very important to describe the reasons why you chose a BS instead of CS

We added further information concerning the choice of combination and why we prefer using the BS combination as well as some information regarding the reconstructive features of the implant-

Fourth comment:

Add some post-operative X-rays, or some radiographic comparison.

X-rays to illustrate the templating preoperatively and comparing this with the postoperative x-ray(s), have been inserted (as fig. 2).

Reviewer 2

Thank you for your expert comments. Below is described the revisions we made.

First comment:

The surgical procedure is not mentioned, neither the amount of bone loss if any.

We added information concerning preoperative templating (incl. x-rays), whether the revision included cup-revision or not and who chooses implant combination. In the discussion it is briefly mentioned that we preferably avoid extended trochanteric osteotomy to preserve bone stock.

The amount of boneloss is described in the results section: "Perioperatively the bone stock was classified according to Saleh et al. [12,13] and we found 48% with type II, 34% with type I, 14% with type III and 2% with type IV and V respectively. "

Second comment

It should be added the short follow up study for revision cases and the fact that from the 116 individuals that were included to the study, 40 patients declined participation in clinical and x-ray follow-up.

The above was elaborated on for clarification.

Third comment

Clarification is needed because the reader is left with the impression that the results relate to all 116 patients according to the analysis. No reply to a questionnaire is mentioned, while in the results' chapter six patients are missing.

The above was elaborated on for clarification.

Editor:

Thank you for the opportunity to revise further.

First comment:

You need to provide the grant application form(s) or certificate of funding agency for every grant, or we will delete the part of "Supported by..."

We uploaded the "First amendment to the clinical study agreement". The study is "Project C".

Second comment:

Please download the file uploaded by the editor on Dec 2, 2019 and include "article highlights" in the manuscript.

We added "article highlights" on the last pages of the manuscript – highlighted in yellow like the other changes.

