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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This manuscript systematically described the ACL reconstruction, and discussed the key points of successful surgery, which is of great reference value to relevant clinical practice. However, there're still some issues which should be addressed. 1. The application of tissue engineering and stem cells in this field is a hot research topic. There are many important research reports and progress. It is recommended that the author fully elaborate on this part to help readers understand the current research progress and the main problems. 2. Complications of ACL are an important issue of concern to surgeons. The authors should elaborate various complications and accidents in the operation, and discuss the prevention methods and principles of treatment. 3. The main points of various surgical methods are too simple. The author should elaborate them one by one, so as to be of reference value to readers. 4. After the elaboration of each surgical method, the author should put forward the indications and operative points of each surgical method based on his own clinical experience. 5. Computer-Aided ACL reconstruction system includes a variety of techniques, including surgical planning, navigation, template, preformed implant, etc. The author only expounds the navigation, and other contents should be added. 6. Artificial substitution material is another important direction in this field, which should be supplemented by the author. So, major revision should be recommended for this manuscript.
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I am glad to see the author has revised this manuscript according to all reviewers’
concern and comments. So, acceptance should be recommended for this manuscript.