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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Dear Authors  I commend ur work on the LARS for ankle instability. I have a few concerns that needs to be answer before i could recommend ur work for publication.  
1. All acronyms to be expanded in its first use including LARS and no acronyms in title and if needed in brackets  
2. Kindly introduce on the LARS in the introduction and the rationale behind its choice and proceed further into the aim of study to test its reliability as an alternate donor for lig reconstruction in the ankle instability scenarios which is done in the discussion part of the script  
3. The methodology part of the study needs to be restricted to the selection criteria and the surgical technique and assessment methods and statistical evluation methods and u ahve give the results in this section which needs to be shifted to the results part of the paper  
4. Kindly perform a language correction with the help of a native language speaker as there are a few spell checks needed at some places and grammatical flaws in the statements made.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Of course: the most interesting thing about this manuscript, is the clinical applicability. Conclusions can be improved, but methodology is correct and I think is suitable to publish.