Author's response to reviews

Title: Trends in knee arthroscopy and subsequent arthroplasty in an Australian population: a retrospective cohort study

Authors:

Ian A Harris (ianharris@unsw.edu.au)
Navdeep S Madan (navdeep.s.madan@gmail.com)
Justine M Naylor (Justine.naylor@sswahs.nsw.gov.au)
Shanley Chong (Shanley.Chong@sswahs.nsw.gov.au)
Rajat Mittal (Rajatmittal.syd@gmail.com)
Bin B Jalaludin (b.jalaludin@unsw.edu.au)

Version: 3 Date: 3 April 2013

Author's response to reviews: see over
3 April 2013

The Editorial Team:
BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders


Dear Editor,

Thank you for providing the reviewers comments regarding the above manuscript. We have addressed each comment separately below, with the comment italicised, the response in plain font, and any extracts from the manuscript indented. We have also attached a copy of the updated manuscript.

1) The authors have advised that “The rates of missing data pertaining to procedure codes not entered cannot be quantified, as the procedure code was used as an inclusion criteria.”

Discretionary Revision #1
Would it be possible to obtain information on the rate of missing procedure codes from CHeReL administrators? This could give the readers an understanding of the potential extent of missed cases. However, I appreciate this might not be possible

Minor Essential Revision # 1
The potential for selection bias (i.e. excluding cases with missing procedures codes) should also be noted in the limitations section.

Unfortunately, we are unable to provide data on the rates of missing procedure codes from the data custodian.

We have noted the potential for selection bias in Discussion Paragraph 6 line 3-4:

“There is also a potential for selection bias due to missing procedure codes. We were unable to obtain the rates of missing procedure codes from the data custodian.”

2) In the limitations section, sentence 4, the authors state “To address this limitation, we undertook an audit for two of the institutions.”

Minor Essential Revision # 2
Could you please indicate in this section, that the audit of 42 records was based on convenience sampling methods and state the time period that the audit covered?

We have noted that the audit was based on convenience sampling methods in the discussion. The audit covered the same time period as the main data.

“To address this limitation, we used a convenience sample from two of the institutions, covering the same time period as the main study. Of 42 retrieved cases of knee arthroscopies followed by total knee replacements, two cases involved contralateral knees, the remaining cases were ipsilateral.”

This response and the attached revised manuscript has been edited and approved by all authors.

Regards,
Navdeep Madan
Medical Student
South Western Sydney Clinical School
University of New South Wales
Liverpool Hospital, Liverpool, NSW, 2170
Email: navdeep.s.madan@gmail.com