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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear Authors I read your manuscript and found to be interesting. However, there are certain flaws in methodology, results interpretation and discussion. It is mentioned in the manuscript attached.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors attempt to determine the Outcomes After Arthroscopic Repair of Small to Large Rotator Cuff Tears in the Setting of Mild to Moderate Glenohumeral Osteoarthritis by comparing matched cohorts with and without GHOA. There is a paucity of literature regarding this topic and the 2 largest studies existing are contradictory. Limitations include the small number of patients and the heterogeneity of treatment within the operative group. The group certainly should be followed for mid-term outcome follow up (5yrs).

1 Title. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript.
2 Abstract. The abstract summarizes and reflects the work described in the manuscript.
Line 6- spelling for similarly
Lines 8-9 - change wording for flow
Lines 11-12 - again, change wording for flow
Introduction - lines 38-42 - The thought process driving this paragraph is understood, but it should be edited for flow
3 Key words. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.
4 Background. The manuscript adequately describes the background, present status and significance of the study - see introduction comment above
5 Methods. The manuscript describes methods in adequate detail.
6 Results. The research objectives are achieved by the experiments used in this study. The results fall in line with the 2019 study on the topic, but not the 2013 study.
7 Discussion. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically. The findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature are stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion is accurate and discusses the paper’s scientific
significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. Lines 207-209 - How many had follow up longer than 2 years? Why include this comment? This could possibly expose a bit a statistical fragility in this study if there are only a handful of patients that were followed past 2 years, but 4 of them went on to get an arthroplasty (when only 2 total did within the 2 years). Lines 227-228 - More of a reason not to include the comment on the patients followed up after 2 years until you have data on all at another future timepoint - say 5 yrs. Illustrations and tables. The figures, diagrams and tables are sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. 9 Biostatistics. The manuscript meets the requirements of biostatistics. 10 Units. The manuscript meets the requirements of use of SI units. 11 References adequate in number and quality. 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. The style, language and grammar is accurate and appropriate. 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. The author prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. The manuscript met the requirements of ethics.