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Reviewers report:

- Major compulsory Revisions

The premise of the paper is a good one – health related topic with radiographic signs of knee OA and associated functional levels in table tennis. The execution needs to be significantly sharpened. I found it difficult to track the argument through the paper regarding the impact of table tennis on OA in ex-elite male table tennis players – it looked like there were too many tangents obscuring the overarching message but not directed to table tennis. The diffraction away from a main message (table tennis) meant that some useful lines of argument were lost – according to the title of the paper!

The paper needs to be reorganised to focus on a consistent clear key message: knee osteoarthritis in table tennis compared with general population!

Re-organisation to a clear message may provide a stronger structure to explain the goals of the paper. Instead putting all the data in the text I suggest including a table with the relevant data and results.

- Minor essential Revisions

The authors might want to re-think their title. Control group in the title is not important!

There were grammatical and spelling errors. Check for English spelling.

It is not important if one is playing with shakehand or penholder regarding loads in table tennis game!

I would like to see some comparison to racket sports rather than to soccer and
football!

Authors should avoid clear neglect of up to date literature. Instead of that they should put in “safety fuse”: according to the authors known literature...

In Methods/Subjects authors should clear the number of participants. First they say 60 and then they are using 22 players from group of 52 players!

Authors should avoid sentences like: “The Chi-square test found a significant… Chi-square cannot found, authors can!

There are some sentences which are too long and are difficult to read.

Authors use some abbreviations which are not explained before!

In References it is not permitted to use et al (Nr. 1, Nr. 4 and Nr. 20)!

In reference Nr. 21 authors are not correct presented! (KONDRI#, Miran, FURJAN-MANDI#, Gordana, ZEKAN PETRINOVU#, Lidija, CILIGA, Dubravka. Comparison of injuries between Slovenian table tennis and badminton players. In LEES, Adrian, CABELLO, David, TORRES LUQUE, Gema (Eds.). Science and racket sports IV. (pp.112-117). London; New York: Routledge.)


Figure 2 should be replaced with other presentation than bar graph!

In Knee alignment outcomes methods are not presented clear. Statistician should clear the methods used in this research!

- Level of interest
An article of importance in its field. Authors still have to add some more weight on table tennis.

- 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

Recommendations for the editors

( ) To accept the paper as it is.

( ) To accept the paper if the authors will modify it upon the demanded revisions.

(X) Communicate to the authors that the study will be accepted only after major revisions and once it will be reviewed again.
To reject the study.

**Level of interest:** An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

**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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