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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Although the quality of the articles, met the inclusion criteria, were not as good as I expected, the statistical analysis in this study did well. Only in the discussion section, I have a suggestion. In page 10, line 209-211, interestingly, Cho et al reported improvement in hindfoot alignment 3 weeks post TKA but little to no improvement at 2 years postoperatively, suggesting that compensatory changes in hindfoot alignment predominantly occur during the early postoperative period. As the change of biomechanics in lower limbs is a complex process, which is one of the reasons why there are so few RCTs in this subject, there should be more discussion in the end of this paragraph.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Title: Alignment of the hindfoot following total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review

General Comments: Overall, this is some interesting paper that has merits. However, there are some questions that remain about the study and I consider that some minor revision is needed.

1. Abstract: The abstract is of appropriate length and summarizes the study well. Line 26: could you clearly specify the purpose? Foot and Ankle clinical outcomes.

2. Introduction: appropriate Line 82: Also clarify what clinical outcomes evaluated are you evaluating.


4. An appropriate statistical analysis is performed

5. Results: appropriate Line 120: I believe “Clinical trials” is not the best way to describe the articles included. Line 164, 168, 174 and 176: Please explain the magnitude of the improvement.

6. Discussion: The discussion is well written.

7. Conclusion: appropriate

TITLE Title is appropriate for the study.

9. Tables and Figures: Figure 1. Please explain the reasons for excluding those 2160 articles.

10. References: References are in correct order and correct format.