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Dear Editors-in-Chief,

Re: manuscript log number 3606262006509712 entitled “Management of degenerative rotator cuff tears: a review of the literature”.

We thank the reviewers for their comments, of which we agree in full, and have amended the paper accordingly. Sorry for the delay in returning the manuscript, but some of the corrections took longer than we had anticipated.

Reviewer 1

The Natural History of a Rotator Cuff Tear, first paragraph
If the author adds some reports of basic research about rotator cuff tendon healing, the readers will be surer that cuff tears are really difficult to heal spontaneously. After “, and may progress with time [5, 8, 9].” , I recommend you to add the sentence something like the following;

This has now been included. Lines 57 to 60.


This has now been included. Lines 65 to 68.

Management, first paragraph
The efficacy about hyaluronate on rotator cuff diseases has been reported recently and this should be included in the author’s manuscript. For example, like the following reports;


This has now been included. Lines 73 to 77.

Operative Management, first paragraph
“.” was missing after “(41% to 94%) [33-35]” and after “[31, 34].

Sorry a reference manager problem – now addressed. Lines 138 and 139.
Conclusion
The author referred to Gartsman [40] in Operative Management, and if this result was statistically significant, there is a clinical evidence to support double row suture bridge technique over single row repair.

We were trying to stress that there was no functional (clinical) advantage over double row technique, despite a lower lower rate of re-tear. This has now been re-worded to address this confusing sentence. Lines 168 to 170.

Figure 1
According to Hamada’s classification, this is grade 3.

Now included with explained in the figure legend.

Reviewer 2
This is an interesting review article that described the epidemiology and management of degenerative rotator cuff tears.
1) However, there were only 40 articles in this review. Reconsider the articles in the base data.
What is a base data? What was a source of journals in this review (Pubmed etc.)?
What kind of journal was included? What was the level of evidence of each article? Level 1-3 study is more scientific than Level4-6 study.
The authors should not include the review articles because present study is a review article.

The aim of this review was to present an over view and a potential management plan, we did not want to perform a systematic review, as these have been performed recently with no evidence to support conservative or operative management. We have changed the title of the paper to reflect the content better: Management of degenerative rotator cuff tears: a review and treatment strategy

2) Introduction
Write the purpose of this study.

Now included in the abstract and introduction. Lines 2 to 3 and 18 to 20.

3) Please make session of diagnosis that includes physical examination and diagnostic tests and imaging study.

There is now a dedicated section on evaluation and diagnosis. Lines 30 to 45.

4) A suggested approach to management of a rotator cuff tear
The effect of tear size and age on the outcome of conservative treatment should be discussed.

Now included. Lines 109 to 115.

5) Figure 4 Lateral anchor may be knotless anchor. Remake the figure.

Figure remade to include suture knots.