

Point-by point response to the Reviewers' comments

- Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics
- Manuscript NO: 78998
- Manuscript Type: RETROSPECTIVE COHORT STUDY

Septic arthritis of the hand: from etiopathogenesis to surgical treatment

Lipatov K.V. et al. Septic arthritis of the hand

Konstantin V Lipatov, Arthur Asatryan, George Melkonyan, Aleksandr D Kazantcev, Ekaterina I Solov'eva, Irina V Gorbacheva, Alexander S Vorotyntsev, Andrey Y Emelyanov

Response to Reviewer 1.

Thank you very much for the kind words of appreciation of our manuscript.

Specific Comments to Authors: «I would like to appreciate the contribution of the authors who are exploring a clinically important issue. However, I have several concerns about their manuscript that need to be addressed. Major comment: The authors' main objective was to explore the possibility of applying Neoarthrosis in the treatment of septic arthritis of the hand with continuous osteomyelitis and whether it could be used as an alternative to conventional Arthrodesis. However, the paper was not written to focus on Neoarthrosis and did not seem to argue why Neoarthrosis could be an alternative strategy to Arthrodesis. In addition, the results section spends a great deal of time describing patient characteristics such as microbial composition, imaging examination, antibiotic therapy, etc.; this seems to be a bit of a distraction from the topic, as it could be well summarized in tables without so much textual description. If your aim is also to include a multifaceted description of this cohort, then the current title is inappropriate as it does not reflect the main content of this paper. Minor comments. 1. the discussion section could be more insightful. Specifically, the current study could be compared to previously published similar studies, such as why the results differ. 2. As a retrospective study, the limitations of this study should be emphasized in the discussion section. 3. Any abbreviations need to be shown in full the first time they appear, including in the abstract».

Point-by point response to the Reviewers' comments: «Dear Dr. Zhen Sun! We thank you for your work in reviewing our manuscript. We highly appreciated all the comments you made during the review. In carrying out this research and writing the manuscript, our main task was to give a detailed description of such a serious disease as septic arthritis of the hand. The

formation of neoarthrosis has become one of the options for surgical treatment of septic arthritis in the development of osteomyelitis. In accordance with your comments, we changed the title of the work to «**Septic arthritis of the hand: from etiopathogenesis to surgical treatment**» and adjusted the purpose of the research: «**To explore the features of the course of septic arthritis of the hand, approaches to surgical treatment and its results depending on the nature of the damage to the articular structures**».

We have expanded the **Discussion** section by adding contraindications to early rehabilitation of patients. We also added **Limitations** to this section.

All abbreviations in the manuscript are now deciphered on first occurrence».

Response to Reviewer 2.

Thank you very much for the kind words of appreciation of our manuscript.

Specific Comments to Authors: «The research idea is good. The Limitations if any may be mentioned».

Point-by point response to the Reviewers' comments: «Dear reviewer! We thank you for your work in reviewing and evaluating our manuscript. In accordance with your recommendations, **Limitations** are formulated in the **Discussion** section».