

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



March 15, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 8552-edited.doc).

Title: Common controversies in total knee replacement surgery. Current evidence.

Author: Vasileios S. Nikolaou, Demetrios Chytas, G. C. Babis

Name of Journal: World Journal of Orthopedics

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8552

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewers

Reviewer 1 :

Total knee replacement is a widely used operation. However, some technical details are still a matter of a strong debate. The review has tried to extract the best and more up-to-date evidence available regarding some of the most debatable subjects in TKR surgery. The review contents is significant. The title and abstract can accurately reflect the major topic, and the conclusion is valuable. In addition, the review has systematic theoretical analyses.

Authors ' reply:

We thank the reviewer for the positive comments.

Reviewer 2:

My only comment is related to the INTRODUCTION section. I would like to see some more details with some reference. For example: a few words and some numbers or statistics about (a) the problem (the knee osteoarthritis), (b) the most common treatment (the TKR), (c) result and complications and finally (d) the common controversies.

Authors' reply:

We thank the reviewer for the comments. We have now updated the introduction adding 3 more paragraphs with references, according to reviewer's suggestions.

Reviewer 3:

This is not a systematic review and the authors should not claim as such. There is minimal detail on

searching (far too little) and no structured methods for selection (inclusion criteria), appraisal, extraction or synthesis. In my opinion the authors either need to position the article as a normal lit review or provide more detail on the above steps.

Authors' reply.

In this literature review an extensive search was conducted in MEDLINE (PubMed) , Web of Science, and the Cochrane database of high quality prospective randomized trials and meta-analyses. In order to be up-to-date and present the most recent findings, we preferred to include in our study only the papers published in the last decade. Initially, one reviewer conducted the literature search and retrieved the references to be evaluated. A second reviewer independently selected the trials to be included in the review and also screened the reference list from the selected articles in order to identify studies that have been missed at the initial search.

We agree with the reviewer that this is not a systematic review (with the strict etymology) but as we define at the introduction, an extensive literature review of the best evidence available (Level I studies) during the last decade. We have corrected the “core tip” section of the manuscript. Thank you.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the World Journal of Orthopedics.

Sincerely yours,



Vasileios S. Nikolaou MD, PhD, MSc
2nd Dept. of Orthopaedics
Athens University
Dimitriou Ralli 21 Str, Maroussi
Athens, 15124
Greece
Fax: +302108022142
E-mail: vassilios.nikolaou@gmail.com