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Dear Editor,

Many thanks for forwarding the reviewer’s comments on our article, “MS: 1746303984773784 - Surgical Options for the Young Patient with an Arthritic Knee”.

Please find attached a revised manuscript, which we hope addresses the points made. Our brief was to write an article to reach, a “broad audience of clinicians and biomedical researchers” and we are unsure that the reviewer’s were aware of this. The primary aim was to debate the surgical interventions for young OA patients with specific reference to unicompartamental knee replacement vs. high tibial osteotomy. We broadened the scope of the article in order to give context to those readers not practicing in Orthopaedics and therefore not familiar with the management of this group of patients. Further surgical options were discussed to reflect our own practice.

We have addressed the reviewer’s points as follows:

- **Title**
  - The title has been changed to, “The Young Osteoarthritic Knee: Dilemmas in Management.”

- **Article type**
  - The tone of the paper has been revised in order to make it clearer that it is an “Opinion piece”.

- **Reviewer 1**
  - Further description of the results of TKR in younger patients added.
  - Section added discussing functional limitations for young patients with TKR.
  - Clarification of the role for chondrocyte implantation techniques in focal cartilage lesions rather than generalised OA. As these techniques are mentioned only as treatment modalities with a potential role for OA patients of the future, we have not included detailed analysis of the studies referenced.

- **Reviewer 2**
  - Page 3: English spelling
  - Page 4: Additional discussion of cost implications of steroid vs. HA added.
  - Page 7: Implication of HTO on Patello-femoral disease added. Further comment on timing and degree of correction added.
  - Page 8: Technical difficulties stressed.
  - Page 10: Contra-indications revised. Weight limits in UKR discussed.
  - Page 10: Section discussing differences in function outcomes HTO vs. UKR
Page 10: “Simple” changed to “straight forward”.
Page 11: Possibility of post-arthroscopy insufficiency fracture mentioned.
Patellofemoral joint arthroplasty discussed.

Reviewer 3

We agree with the Editor that a systematic review is beyond the remit of the article.

We hope that these revisions meet with your approval.

Yours Faithfully,

E. Holloway
P. Sutton