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**Reviewer's report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
As stated in the introduction the present study tries to answer the question if there is a correlation between the concentration of BMP-2 and BMP-7 in knees and the clinical outcome after surgery for cartilage repair.

The aim of the study is well defined and the question to be answered posed precisely.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
In the material and methods section the inclusion and exclusion criteria are described in detail. The authors also give accurate information on the operation protocols, specimen collection, characterization of patients, grading of cartilage damage, methods used for protein quantification and statistics.

All methods used in the present study are well approved and have already been published in a series of different studies.

3. Are the data sound?
The present study shows a significant correlation between the concentration of BMP-2 in the joint fluid and the clinical outcome one year after surgery.

Former studies could proof a correlation between cartilage regeneration and the degree of clinical improvement as well as a stimulating effect of BMP-2 on the collagen II expression a proteoglycan synthesis.

For this reason the results of this study are in accordance with the data found in literature.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
The data is clearly arranged in figures, mean and standard deviation as well as p values are given whenever needed.

5. Are the discussion and conclusion well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
The discussion sets the data obtained in this study into perspective to what is already known about the role of BMP-2 and BMP-7 in joint metabolism and cartilage regeneration. The conclusions made by the authors are supported
sufficiently by the data.
In Version 4 of this manuscript the authors give a good perspective on further studies.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, the authors comment clearly on limitations of the study and give perspectives how these limitations could be addressed in further trails.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
All works the present study is based on are cited in the text.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Title and abstract give a good overview of the aim, methods and results of the study.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
The study is written in excellent English without major mistakes in grammar, spelling or expression.
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