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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor:

Please find attached a revised version of our manuscript, "A Biomechanical Analysis of Triangular Medial Knee Reconstruction" which we would like to resubmit for publication as an experimental study in BMC.

Your comments and those of the reviewers were highly insightful and enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments of the reviewers and your own.

In accordance with Reviewer’s suggestion, we have explicitly state which results were better.

We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses are sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in BMC.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.
Yours sincerely,

Professor Fei Wang

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery

Third Hospital of Hebei Medical University

Shijiazhuang, Hebei 050051, China

Tel.:15832178509

E-mail:doctorwf@yeah.net

Reviewers' comments:

1. Abstract Line 36-39: Please rephrase. The sentence is not clear…

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We have corrected it as your advices in the abstract. The sentence was rephrased, and we hope it to be clear for interpretation. We have recruited a fluent English speaker to edit our manuscript as your recommendation.

2. Background: From line 65 to line 74: "Play" …. is written too much times please change it.

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We have corrected it in the background as your advices. The sentence was rewritten to reduce "Play" and we hope the correction would make the sentence more fluent.

3. Line 55: "Injurie" - Injuries

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We are sorry to our faults. This was a spelling error and we have corrected it in the manuscript.

4. Line 70: "extorsion"?

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We indeed mean the extorsion instability, and we have replaced the "extorsion" with the "external rotation ".

5. Line 93-102: Both the purpose of the study and your thesis are missing. You should thoroughly describe why are you conducting the study and what do you expect to find.

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We have clearly described our purpose and thesis in the background following your suggestion, and we hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses are sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in BMC.

6. Materials and Methods Line 115: "thought" – through

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We are sorry to our faults. This was a spelling error and we have corrected it in the materials and methods.

7 Line 118-120: how were valgus and rotational moments decided? Have you used a similar study as reference? If so you should mention it. Pictures of this procedure could provide a better understanding.

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. The valgus and rotational moments were decided according to a similar study, and we have added the reference in the materials and methods. I have added the image to illustrate it.

8 Discussion Line 289-291: triangular technique is surely less invasive, but you should demonstrate or cite how it does reduce expenses or hospitalization time.

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We have clearly demonstrate how it does reduce expenses, and our study is actually insufficient to demonstrate how it does reduce hospitalization time hence we removed this point.

Reviewers2's comments:

1 The main issue I have with the manuscript is that the spelling, syntax, and grammar are poor and make it difficult to read at times. These errors are too numerous to list here. I recommend that the authors recruit a fluent English speaker to edit the manuscript in order to correct these mistakes
Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We have recruited a fluent English speaker to edit our manuscript as your recommendation.

2 The only other note I have is if the authors could include a justification for the amount of force used during the biomechanical analysis. Eg.- How did they determine that 5 N was adequate for certain motions.

Response: Thanks for your kind suggestion. We have include a justification for the amount of force used during the biomechanical analysis according to a similar study, and we we have added the reference in the materials and methods. (Coobs BR, Wijdicks CA, Armitage BM, Spiridonov SI, Westerhaus BD, Johansen S, et al. An in vitro analysis of an anatomical medial knee reconstruction. Am J Sports Med 2010;38(2):339-47.)