

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to re-submit the revised manuscript. We are very grateful for the time and effort spent by reviewers in providing such valuable feedback and insightful comments. We have been able to address all comments and suggestions received. Changes were highlighted within the manuscript.

Here is a point-to-point response to comments and concerns raised by reviewers:

<p>Reviewer comment #1:</p>	<p>Reviewer #1:  <b>Scientific Quality:</b> Grade D (Fair)  <b>Language Quality:</b> Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)  <b>Conclusion:</b> Major revision  <b>Specific Comments to Authors:</b> This manuscript goes into extensive detail on hamstring graft reconstruction of the ACL and presents itself as a review type article. However, the methodology section of this paper could be further developed. Specifically, it seems the authors of this manuscript present a systematic-review style of paper, but this review also has characteristics which make it fit a narrative review. Regardless, it would benefit greatly to include specific search methodology in the form of a query, other than the direct terms. Additionally, was the term IPBSN Injury search directly into Pubmed, or were variations allowed? please specify this in the methodology for all terms of interest. The methodology does not elaborate on temporal limits to publication dates. This may lead to assumption of all article availables. Please specify The methodology may also benefit from providing additional parameters such as "full-text" status, etc. Were PRISMA guidelines observed in this paper? If so, this ought to be specified. However, if this was a narrative review, then were there any guidelines followed for the appraisal of literature? For example, it would benefit the findings of this study if articles were appraised using a narrative review checklist or guide such as SANRA. If guidelines are used, please also consider providing diagrams. Additionally, if this was a systematic review design, were AMSTAR 2 guidelines established? "The large number of articles of different study designs that reported no difference in hamstring strength between the two groups could be attributed to the method of strength evaluation used" - please cite This manuscript addresses a important area of literature and the authors provide extensive analysis. I recommend the authors review language polishing during revisions, if possible.</p>
<p>Response:</p>	<p><b>Comment #1:</b> <i>[the methodology section of this paper could be further developed. Specifically, it seems the authors of this manuscript present a systematic-review style of paper, but this review also has characteristics which make it fit a narrative review. Regardless, it would benefit greatly to include</i></p>

	<p><i>specific search methodology in the form of a query, other than the direct terms. Additionally, was the term IPBSN Injury search directly into Pubmed, or were variations allowed? please specify this in the methodology for all terms of interest.]</i></p> <p>Thank you for pointing this out. We agree that our manuscript could be misinterpreted as a systematic review rather than a narrative review article. Therefore, we have made some changes to the title that we believe will clarify this uncertainty. The methodology section has been revised with these comments in mind and modified accordingly.</p> <p><b>Comment #2:</b> <i>[The methodology does not elaborate on temporal limits to publication dates. This may lead to assumption of all article availables. Please specify The methodology may also benefit from providing additional parameters such as "full-text" status, etc.]</i></p> <p>We agree with this argument, and have incorporated your suggestions.</p> <p><b>Comment #3:</b> <i>[Were PRISMA guidelines observed in this paper? If so, this ought to be specified. However, if this was a narrative review, then were there any guidelines followed for the appraisal of literature? For example, it would benefit the findings of this study if articles were appraised using a narrative review checklist or guide such as SANRA. If guidelines are used, please also consider providing diagrams. Additionally, if this was a systematic review design, were AMSTAR 2 guidelines established?]</i></p> <p>Thank you for raising an important point. However, as mentioned above this is a narrative review article and accordingly we have relied on the expertise of our senior authors for the appraisal of literature.</p> <p><b>Comment #4:</b>  <i>["The large number of articles of different study designs that reported no difference in hamstring strength between the two groups could be attributed to the method of strength evaluation used" - please cite]</i></p> <p>Citation have been added. Thank you for mentioning this error.</p> <p><b>Comment # 5:</b> <i>[language polishing during revisions, if possible.]</i></p> <p>Language editing by “editag®”. An editing certificate have been submitted.</p>
Reviewer comment	<p><b>Scientific Quality:</b> Grade B (Very good)</p> <p><b>Language Quality:</b> Grade B (Minor language polishing)</p>

#2:	<p><b>Conclusion:</b> Accept (General priority)</p> <p><b>Specific Comments to Authors:</b> Thank you authors for giving me an opportunity, review your article. The article is about the different approaches for harvesting the hamstring graft, its fixation methods in ACL reconstruction. The authors have written the review clearly and extensively. I have only one suggestion it is better you could include different articles used in your review in tables and discuss about the main ones in the text. Regards</p>
Response:	<p><b>Comment #1:</b> <i>[I have only one suggestion it is better you could include different articles used in your review in tables and discuss about the main ones in the text.]</i></p> <p>Thank you for your suggestion. However, our aim is to extensively analyze literature in a narrative manner to provide the reader with an inclusive overview of the reviewed topic. Tables included are meant for a quick and easy summary.</p>