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**Reviewer's report:**

Thank you for the opportunity to review the manuscript entitled “10 year follow up after Roux-Elmslie-Trillat operation in case of patellar instability” by S Endres. The article consist of a review of 18 patients who underwent a Roux-Elmslie-Trillat procedure.

The scientific question being answered, I gather, is whether or not this procedure should be performed for patellar instability. The question is not clearly stated in the manuscript. The methods section is not clearly written and has left some important questions unanswered such as: Is this a prospective or retrospective study? Who did the surgery? Is this a functional outcome study? What are the primary outcomes measured? What are the secondary outcomes measured? Who assessed the patients? Who did the radiographic assessments? Were multiple radiographic assessors used and if so what was the inter observer variability? Lost to follow up?

Inclusion and exclusion criteria were explained.

Without the abovementioned questions answered, it is difficult to determine if the data was sound.

Presentation of the data was done via one chart. It is conventional to break up the data presentation into multiple charts separating demographics and results. Statistical analysis is generally done by a statistician. For example, was a power analysis performed to ensure that the study is powered enough to show “no difference” in some of the outcomes measured? Was that the case in this study?

The authors do clearly review the literature. In my opinion, the Discussion section was slightly long. The abstract reflected the article well. Generally, the writing could be improved.

**Revisions:**

- Minor essential: page 2 line 23 needs to be rewritten “instability can in line with…”
- Page 2 Line 26 intervertebral laxity needs to be explained
- Page 3 line 13 “in a clinical trial…” is that this clinical trial? Another trial? Clarify.
- Page 5 line 23 instead of “spongious” use “cancellous”
- Page 7 line 3 “slight to medium intra-articular contusion…” should be explained. Consider providing an image.
- Page 7 line 12 define “ASK”
Results chart: break up into two or three charts
Shorten the discussion section.

Major Compulsory:
State scientific question more clearly.
Answer the following:
Is this a prospective or retrospective study?
Who did the surgery?
Is this a functional outcome study?
What are the primary outcomes measured?
What are the secondary outcomes measured?
Who assessed the patients?
Who did the radiographic assessments? Provide diagrams and images explaining the measurements.
Were multiple radiographic assessors used and if so what was the inter observer variability?
Lost to follow up?
Expand on statistics using a statistician.
Do a power analysis.
Comment on number revised to TKR or other surgical procedure.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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