

Dear Editor

Thank you for the opportunity to revise the paper. We appreciate the valuable input of the reviewers and have improved the paper according to their suggestions, as outlined below.

*Reviewer 1. good review paper, but it needs some work. please discuss treatments and outcomes BASED on AC dislocation type. particular attention should be given to type 3 AC dislocation treatment, still a controversial injury. include reference by Murena L et al on treatment with flip-button, as well as papers on treatment with Tightrope.*

Thank you for the compliments. Treatment is indeed highly dependent on the type of dislocation, with the most controversy in type 3 dislocations. We have outlined the different treatment options with respect to dislocation type in different sections of the article, including the abstract (p. 2) and under "Treatment", especially the first paragraph (p. 7). In addition, we have now added more specific notes on type 3 and the other types in the "Outcomes" section (p. 15 and 16). Furthermore, we have added the article by Murena et al on p. 12. The Tightrope treatment is discussed on p. 13 and in numerous references (ref 28, 41, 50, 60, 74).

*Reviewer 2*

*The authors present a timely review of AC joint injuries. The manuscript is well presented and easy to follow. While not most original of topics, the topic is clinically relevant and will be of interest to the readership. Further, the manuscript is comprehensive. The manuscript is well structured and clearly laid out.*

*Reviewer 3*

*The authors present a nice review about the current state of AC-Joint separation. There is still controversy about the treatment. The authors state the pros and cons about non-operative, open surgical and arthroscopical surgical treatment. Nice table of comparative studies. Nice intraoperative pictures and figures explaining the text. Objections: Are there any outcome-data of the own presented method ??*

Thank you for the kind comments and for the suggestion of adding own data. We have added our own outcomes on p. 12.

Overall, we feel these changes have improved the manuscript and look forward to the final decision.

With kind regards,

Christiaan van Bergen, MD PhD