

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



August 25, 2012

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 2429-review.doc).

Title: Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstruction Best Practice – A Review of Graft Choice

Author: Shaerf D, Pastides P, Sarraf K, Willis-Owen C

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Orthopedics*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 4151

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

GENERAL COMMENTS MAY CONSIST OF FOUR MAJOR POINTS (1) The importance of the research and the significance of the research contents; (2) The novelty and innovation of the research; (3) Presentation and readability of the manuscript; and (4) Ethics of the research. The research concepts are fairly important; however the presentation of the introduction, discussion, comparative studies, and conclusions does not include all the problems of the research. The systematic review concept of best practice in ACL reconstruction is not novel to the literature, of course, there is not enough evidence available in the literature, and so this work may have a place in the literature. The importance of this work would be in reference to the graft choice in ACL reconstruction, however, the description of the clinical studies (results) using different grafts not clarify the problem of graft choice in all specific cases.

We thank the review for the overall summary. As they rightly point out, this is a huge topic which will not be answered conclusively with a single article. We tried to pick well designed studies, published in respectable journals to argue the points.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS MAY CONSIST OF THE FOLLOWING POINTS Title: It accurately reflects the major topics and contents of the systematic review. The title describes the work but does not reflect the results. Abstract: The abstract is an adequate representation of the components of the manuscript. It is better written than the manuscript itself.

We thank the reviewer for their comments.

Introduction: There is poor justification of the need for the systematic review. There is minimal discussion of timing for ACL reconstruction and graft choice in competitive athlete who participates in pivoting sports. The introduction does not specify problems

concerning the revision ACL surgery and multi-ligament reconstructions. A purpose is stated.

The question about timing in ACL reconstruction is indeed important and relevant. However the purpose of this manuscript is graft choice options. To include a meaningful section on timing of the ACL reconstruction, we believe, would be a separate paper that we would be happy to consider writing.

Discussion: It is questionable on which grounds did the authors decide on the studies and their results which are represented in graft choice section. Section comparative studies should include some studies with isokinetic measurements at six months and at one or two years follow-up comparing muscles (flexor/ extensor) strength deficit after ACL reconstruction.

There is a multitude of studies in the orthopaedic literature regarding the choice of graft in ACL reconstruction. We decided to select a collection of systematic reviews and single series studies to present the choices available for the operating surgeon. However a new section describing several studies looking at the isokinetic measurements following reconstruction has been added at the end of the manuscript (highlighted in the text).

Conclusions: They are well organized. Valuable conclusions are provided but there is nothing new for the reader.

We thank the reviewer for their comments

References: Are appropriate, relevant, and updated.

We thank the reviewer for their comments

Sincerely yours,

Mr Philip Pastides MRCS, MSc

Department of Trauma and Orthopedics, Charing Cross Hospital, Imperial NHS Trust, Fulham Palace Road, London W6 8RF, United Kingdom