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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear, Editor

We really appreciate for your great generosity in reviewing our study “Pre-operative factors correlated with arthroscopic reparability of large-to-massive rotator cuff tears”. We meticulously read your comments and put a lot of effort to revise the manuscript. While we were revising this article, we used a ‘track change’ mode to show what we have corrected. Furthermore, we mentioned a point-by-point response as you recommended. All authors approve this revised manuscript as an honest work, then we send an attached file of the authors’ approved letter. Thank you for giving us this opportunity. We are looking forward to hear from you.

Best regards,

Niti Prasathaporn, MD
Corresponding author
Reviewer 1

¥ Thank you for your review. The revised article has been already corrected an English grammar by a native English physician, following your recommendation.

¥ (Page 2, Line 39-40) “This should be mentioned in the methods and not in the results.”
   - We have placed that sentence to the method part instead of the result part as you suggested.

¥ (Page 3, Line 74-77) “These sentences need to be improved. It is hard to get the clue.”
   - We amended the sentence to make it clearer.

¥ (Page 3, Line 79) “Balooning is not a word for this context. I would rather use “subacromial spacer”.”
   - We have deleted the word “balooning” out of the sentence.

¥ (Page 3, Line 101-102) “Revision of the sentence recommendable…”
   - We revised the sentence as you recommended.

¥ (Page 4, Line 115) “symptoms”
   - We add “s” as you suggested.

¥ (Page 4, Line 119-122) “This sentence needs to be edited.”
   - We edited the sentence as much as possible. In our method, we let each observer measuring radiographic and MRI parameters for two time. Those two sets of the data from each observer were analysed to see the intra-observer reliability in each observer. Then, mean value of every parameter was calculated for each observer. After that, we use mean value of the parameter from each observer to calculate the inter-observer reliability.
“Germany”
- We changed it into “Germany” as you suggested.

“partial repair”
- We corrected it into “Partial repair” as you suggested.

“one digit after the point is sufficient”
- We have deleted the second digit after the point as you suggested.

“You probably mean 65 years or older.”
- We corrected it as you suggested.

“Is there an acromial distance that would permit the attempt of arthroscopic rotator cuff repair? What are the limits? When would you recommend reverse shoulder arthroplasty?”
- From our study, we suggested that AHI is only one of the three predicting factors. However, only one factor cannot determine the surgical treatment. Therefore, we don’t recommend to use only AHI to make a decision of reverse shoulder arthroplasty.

“broad”
- We changed it into “broad” as you suggested.

“weeks”
- We have added “s” as you suggested.
Reviewer 2

(1) (Page 4, Line 123-125) “First, three surgeons performed rotator cuff repair and no information is given about their experiences, introducing uncontrolled, potentially confounding variable. The findings would have been strengthened if this was a single surgeon design.”

- From our routine arthroscopic surgery, there were three surgeons performing an operation. All surgeons had more than 5 years of experiences in rotator cuff surgery with about 200 cases of arthroscopic shoulder surgery in each year. On the other hand, we believe the more number of surgeon, the more it can represent a variety in realistic. That is the main reason we intended to include more than one surgeon.

(1) (Page 4, Line 127-129) “The methodology is not clearly described. Although the authors stated that tear size was confirmed using a probe arthroscopically, there is no mention of intraoperative assessments.”

- We have mentioned the intraoperative assessment of the tear size by using a probe intraoperatively in line 87-89 with some add on of further explanation.

Reviewer 3

(1) Thank you for your review. The revised article has been already corrected an English grammar by a native English physician, following your recommendation.