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Very strom PROMs study. The analysis on regression between Cincinnati and KOS-ADLS is interesting and translate well to clinical outcomes.
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This is an interesting and meaningful study, and I recommend accept.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This is an interesting project, however, I feel it requires a larger population to be validated, as different factors, such as participants’ age, gender, level of athletic commitment, type of sport as the intricacies of many sports is different, chronicity of condition, type of surgery, patients that had opted out of surgery, return to sport ease and level of return-to-sport may affect the questionnaire scores. I suggest this is an interesting study, worthy of publication, as the authors have a very good command of the PROs used and their intricacies. However, to do so, the authors should tone-down their findings, as these may be affected by all the above-mentioned moderating factors. Why were only 34 patients included post-operatively, instead of 50? Indeed, further work may prove useful in pooling results collected via different scales in ACL injured and ACL-operated patients.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The study was structured methodically competently. The results are of more methodological interest than clinical. Therefore, it is important that the results of the regression be obtained on a sample of sufficient size. According to the reviewer, the number of patients in this study is not enough to obtain reliable regression equations. The study may be of interest in that the authors found an increase in the correlation of the questionnaire data obtained after surgery.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It was a pleasure reviewing the manuscript titled "Patient Reported Outcome Measures in Anterior Cruciate Ligament Rupture and Reconstruction: The Value of Outcome Score Prediction". It is true that numerous PROM scores exist for knee and ACL reconstruction. And there is currently no information regarding their correlation among each other. The abstract and keywords are adequate. Although the idea is novel, the sample size is grossly inadequate and has not been documented in the manuscript. The patients with meniscal tears have also been included. With the current aim of study, ideally isolated ACL patients should have been included. Newer scores like JACL-25 could have been included.

1. The title needs modification. The current title doesn't show the reader any direction. "The value of outcome score prediction" needs change or editing.
2. The introduction is lengthy. It should focus on existing literature and the need for this study. The first paragraph definition of handicap and disability etc. can be trimmed.
3. Why were patients of meniscal tear not excluded.
4. All the paragraphs in the results section start with a figure or table information. That should be altered.
5. What was the calculated sample size?