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Dear Dr. Yueju,

thank you for your kind email dated May 7th 2015. We thank you and the referees for their constructive critique as well as their helpful comments which are highly appreciated.

Please find attached the reviewer’s comments along with our point-to-point-response. Changes made in the revised manuscript have been highlighted in xx. We hope that the revised manuscript matches with your approval.

Sincerely,

Dr. Philipp Lechler
**Referee 1:**
Accept as it is.
It is an interesting study, which is well designed. The language is fluent, and the results of the study are credible and meaningful in our clinical practice. I suggest it should be accepted as it is.

A: *We thank the referee for his efforts during the review process and thoughtful comments.*

**Referee 2:**
Major revisions:
1. In the methods section, the authors should give detailed information regarding the inclusion and exclusion criteria of the investigation.

A: *The reviewer is right. The detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria are given in the revised Patients and Methods section.*

2. If possible, I would like to suggest the authors add case report regarding one or two cases of grade 3 to 4 of Kellgren and Lawrence classification with complete follow up outcomes as well as radiological data in the results section.

A: *An illustrative case of a patient with grade 3 osteoarthritis has been included in the results section. Complete clinical outcome data as well as radiographic documentation (Figure 3 A – C) has been added. The authors thank the referee for this constructive comment, which resulted in an improved comprehensibility of the manuscript.*
3. In the limitation of the discussion section, just as the authors stated, the follow up time is too short. I would suggest using “short-term” rather than “mid-term” for expression of the outcomes. Additionally, it should also be noted that at 12-month follow up time, only 13 patients left in group of grade 3 and 4 of Kellgren and Lawrence classification. Therefore, it is recommended that authors should also mention this limitation, as limited sample size may also affect the outcomes.

A: The authors thank the referee for his thoughtful comments regarding the limitations of the study. We have further highlighted the 12 months follow up time by changing the word mid- to short-term follow up and included a paragraph discussing the limited sample size of the study.

Despite these methodological limitations, the authors are convinced that the findings of the present study add substantial knowledge to our field.