

## **Point-by-point response to peer review report.**

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** Good article comparing costs and outcome the costs of the instrumentation and the sterilization have been compared. would be clear in a detailed table with the individual parameters as well as total cost. analysis and the discussion have been well structured the references could be updated to include more recent references Comparative Study Int Orthop. 2017 Jul;41(7):1361-1367. doi: 10.1007/s00264-016-3356-3. Epub 2016 Dec 19. Patient specific instrumentation versus conventional knee arthroplasty: comparative study Vlad Predescu 1, Catalin Prescura 2, Razvan Olaru 2, Liliana Savin 3, Paul Botez 4, Bogdan Deleanu 5 Affiliations expand PMID: 27995304 DOI: 10.1007/s00264-016-3356-3 Patient specific guides for total knee arthroplasty are ready for primetime. Schotanus MG, Boonen B, Kort NP. World J Orthop. 2016 Jan 18;7(1):61-8. doi: 10.5312/wjo.v7.i1.61. eCollection 2016 Jan 18. PMID: 2680735 There are 2 more studies from 2022 however they are after January 2022 when the 2nd literature search was done for this article. Overall the article is well written good concept and the cost comparison has been well done.

Response to reviewer #1:

- First, thank you for the time and effort to review our article.
- Clear and detailed tables with all the individual parameters per study as well as total costs are presented in the appendices of the article. These are not presented in the full text as the amount of data is too extensive to provide a clear overview for readers. For interested readers all of the data is available, nevertheless. These have been attached in the supplementary materials document.
- The references given by peer reviewer #1 have been utilized in the updated version of the manuscript as they indeed provide additional and relevant information.
- The two additional studies from more recent searches mentioned by peer reviewer #1 have not been used in the revised version of the manuscript as they were published after the submission date of the manuscript.