

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Dear Editor,

Thank you so much for the time dedicated to our manuscript and for giving us the chance of improving its quality.

Please find enclosed our answers to reviewers.

We really hope that now the manuscript could be accepted for publication on your prestigious Journal.

Best Regards

Berardo Di Matteo and co-authors

Reviewer 1

- This is very interesting review article on biologic agents for ACL injuries healing. From my point of view, it is a useful information for readers, so I would congratulate the authors for their initiative. It follows the structure defined by PRISMA for this type of reports, it is well English-written and has a correct methodology and structure. Congrats again. These are my comments related to the manuscript: - I miss the running head, and the core tip for the paper.

Reply: Running head and core tip added in the text.

- Please, specify the range of the years that cover your search. You stated that search was conducted on March 31st, but since when?. Indicate in the text the lower limit of date to include studies for review.

Reply: Range of years specified in the text. Our research focused on the papers published in the last 20 years (1996-2016) as stated now in line 174-175.

- Usually systematic reviews include the search in several databases. What is the rationale to use only Pubmed?

Reply: Thank you for raising the issue of the database. For sure it would have been better to include more databases as suggested by the reviewer, but according to our experience this wouldn't have provided a different results, since the focus is on the important papers, which are always present in Pubmed, thus not jeopardizing the overall results of our literature analysis. Furthermore current PRISMA GUIDELINES FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS require that "at least one database" is used for research and, in light of this indication, Pubmed is the obvious choice since it is the most complete and easiest to access medical database available all over the world. In our research, beyond screening on the Pubmed, we also screened the reference lists of the selected papers, in order to be sure to include all the trials published on the specific topic. We really believe to have included and discussed all the available evidence on the topic, and particularly all the randomized trials. We hope that our choice, consistent with the PRISMA GUIDELINES, could be deemed acceptable for the purposes of the present paper.

Reviewer 2

- The authors did very good job but in Conclusion they have soften their Discussion statements. I would suggest to include some of the Discussion statements in Conclusion like: "the literature is not conclusive with regards to the benefit of PRP application in providing a faster recovery and better functional outcome"

Reply: Addition done (line 406-408) in the conclusion according to the reviewer suggestion.