

Dear Editor,

We are hereby submitting a revised version of the manuscript now entitled “Neuropathic pain-like symptoms and pre-surgery radiographic severity contribute to patient satisfaction 4.8 years post-total joint replacement” for further consideration for publication at the World Journal of Orthopaedics. We have addressed all the issues raised by the editors and reviewers. Please find below details of how the recommended amendments and clarifications have been addressed

Reviewer #1

1. Sample size must be calculated based on primary outcome and objective.

Author’s response: we have added a power calculation in the first paragraph of the results clarifying that the study is powered for the primary outcome

2. The objective of the study must be consistent in both abstract and introduction part.

Author’s response: We have now made the objective consistent between both sections.

3. The final model is quite complicated not appropriate for clinical practice.

Author’s response: We agree that the full model is complicated and difficult to implement in clinical practice. We have added text in the discussion acknowledging this. However, the PainDETECT model alone, which achieves a very similar AUC is not and requires the mere application of a questionnaire and the score of possible NP vs no NP and hence we have modified the discussion to reflect this.

4. The authors should make an explanation or postulation on the result of the study and also the clinical implication.

Author’s response: We have modified the last paragraph of the Discussion to do precisely this

5. Conclusion must be concise and not extrapolate from the results of the study

Author’s response: We have shortened the final conclusion paragraph at the end of the Discussion which is concise and highlights the clinical implication of the study.

6. References must be checked in both format and validity such as reference number 12, 13, 16, 22, 29.

Author's response: We have checked the five references suggested by the reviewer and have made the necessary changes to ensure that the format is consistent and the numbering is valid

**Comments To
Authors**

This is a well written paper and well organized study. The authors have explored some of the reasons why patient satisfaction varies among individuals and identified preoperative traits that may be contributing factors. Congratulations on completing this interesting paper. The graphs are appropriate and helpful and the bibliography is complete.

Author's response: We thank the reviewer for their positive assessment of our **manuscript**

**Comments To
Authors**

This is a very serious paper dealing with the results of joints replacement. It is vary well planned and vary well written

Author's response: We thank the reviewer for their positive assessment of our **manuscript**

My co-authors and myself want to thank the reviewers and the editors for their careful reading and helpful comments on our manuscript and we look forward to hearing from you in due course

On behalf of all authors

Yours sincerely,

Sophie Warner