

Thessaloniki, May 27th 2021

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank you for accepting to reconsider our manuscript titled: “Assessing the accuracy of arthroscopic and open measurements of the size of rotator cuff tears: A simulation-based study.” for publication in the World Journal of Orthopedics.

We would also like to thank the reviewers for their insightful comments. All points raised are addressed and the manuscript was revised according to their suggestions. All text changes in the manuscript have been highlighted. For reviewing purposes, the comments have been addressed one by one. Please note that the line numbering corresponds to the revised manuscript as submitted.

In more detail:

Reviewer #1:

Comment: The aim in abstract should be modified for better understanding.

Reply: *The aim of the study in the abstract has been revised.*

Comment: Is there a possibility that the errors made in measurement are not due to observer variation but due to the arthroscopic instrument used?

Reply: *We agree with your point and thank you for your comment. Although the more experienced surgeons were more accurate, the constant underestimation of the measurements to all levels of experience show that the instrumentation commonly used (a 5-mm probe) is not suitable for precise measurements. This information was added both to the Discussion section (“It seems that more experienced surgeons tend to be more accurate, although the underestimation is constant to all levels of experience, implicating that the instrumentation used is not suitable for precise measurements.”) and to the conclusion section (“These observations raise the need for the development of better arthroscopic tools and techniques for the evaluation of the size of the rotator cuff tears.”)*

Science editor:

Comment: 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.

Reply: *The original figures have been inserted in a PowerPoint file and submitted with the revision files.*

Comment: The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Reply: *The “Article Highlights” section has been added at the end of the main text.*

Once again, we would like to thank you and the reviewers for your time and effort. Please do not hesitate to contact me for any further clarifications and corrections regarding the submitted Manuscript.

Yours sincerely,
Dimitrios Kitridis, MD
Corresponding Author