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Natalia Marczewska

BMC Surgery Editorial office

Dear Ms. Marczewska,

Thank you very much for your decision regarding our manuscript (Submission ID BSUR-D-17-00195).
We have revised the manuscript based on the comments from the editor and reviewers. We hope that the reviewers maintain their favorable opinions and once again recommend publication of this manuscript in BMC Surgery.

We apologize for having confused the “Ethics approval” and “Consent to participate”. Consent to participate was obtained from all study participants before the experiment. Ethics approval was obtained retrospectively after re-approaching the ethics committee following the first round of peer review. However, we were initially told ethics approval was not necessary by mistake.

I commented on each item separately below, and include descriptions of the changes made to the manuscript.

Sincerely yours,

Hironobu Koseki M.D.

Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Graduate School of Medicine, Nagasaki University, 1-7-1, Sakamoto, Nagasaki, Japan

Tel: +81-95-819-7321; Fax: +81-95-849-7325

1. Consent to participate

The authors performed the three patterns of physical movements in the present study to mimic some of the intraoperative actions that take place during major orthopedic surgery. Prior to the experiment, all study participants were informed both verbally and in writing of the objectives of the study, and they were asked to sign a consent form when they agreed to participate in the study. We added a description of the consent to participate in the “Declarations section” of our manuscript. (Declarations section, lines 21–22, page 12)
2. Ethics approval

When we initially applied for ethics approval from the ethics committee of our institute before conducting the experiment, we obtained the following response.

“The ethics guidelines for medical research in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki were not applicable to this study because it did not involve human subjects, human materials, nor did it use data from actual patients. You should seek ethics approval again when this study begins to handle this type of data.”

Therefore, we decided that this study was granted an exemption from requiring ethics approval. We should have clearly stated this in the manuscript.

After we received your comments following the first round of review, we consulted with the ethics committee again and obtained a provisional ethics approval retrospectively. However, this ethics approval should be issued prior to the experiment, so we revised the manuscript to reflect that the ethics committee granted an exemption from requiring ethics approval. (Declarations section, line 23, page 12 to lines 2, page 13)