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Author’s response to reviews:

Response to Sondos Majeed’s Comments:

Thank you very much for your valuable recommendations. We have provided responses to each of your comments below.

Comment 1. The last section of the abstract should be Trial Registration: listing the trial registry and the unique identifying number, e.g. Trial registration: Current Controlled Trials ISRCTN73824458, as well as the date of registration. Please note that there should be no space between the letters and numbers of the trial registration number. If registration took place after the first participant was enrolled, please state also “Retrospectively registered” at the end of this section.
Response: Because the registration took place after the first participant was enrolled, we did not change the statement as “Retrospectively registered” (page 4, lines 8).

Comment 2. Please note that Consent for publication refers to consent for the publication of identifying images or other personal or clinical details of participants that compromise anonymity. Seeing as this is not applicable to your manuscript please state “Not Applicable” in this section.

Response: I have revised the sentence as you had pointed out (page 14, lines 16).

Comment 3. Thank you for including a data availability statement. This statement should detail the location of the raw data underlying the conclusions made in this study and stating who can be contacted to request the raw data. If there are any ethics restrictions preventing the sharing of the raw data, please state this. If you do not wish to share the data, please include a reason why it will not be shared in this section.

Response: We have added the reason of the restriction preventing the sharing the raw data as follows; The dataset supporting the conclusions of the article is proprietary to Iwai Orthopaedic Medical Hospital and will not be shared, because the hospital restricts sharing of the raw data with concerned personnel only (page 14, line 19-page 15, line 1).

Comment 4. We would like to ask for you to provide more justification for the contributions of YT, HK, YY, RS, YO, and SB; HO; ST and KM, as currently they do not automatically qualify for authorship. Contribution to performing experiments; conducting statistical analysis; supervising the study (respectively), alone, does not usually justify authorship.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. According to the ICMJE guidelines, to qualify as an author one should have:

a) made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; AND

b) been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND

c) given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content; AND

d) agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.
Response: We have made the authors’ contributions easy to understand as follows;

JT and HI conceived the study. JT, HI, YT, HK, YY, RS, YO, and SB performed the experiments, the acquisition of data, and the interpretation of the results. HO conducted the statistical analysis. JT drafted the manuscript. HO, ST, and KM revised it critically. ST and KM supervised the study. All authors participated in the review of the manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript (page 15, lines 5-10).

Comment 5. In the Funding section of the Declarations, all sources of funding for the research reported should be declared. If no funding was obtained for your study please revise your statement with “No funding was obtained for this study”.

Response: We have revised the sentence as you had pointed out (page 15, line 12).

Comment 6. At this stage, please upload your manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethroughs or text in different colours. All relevant tables/figures/additional files should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files.

Response: We will upload the revised manuscript as final clean version.