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Reviewer’s report:

Dear authors,

I agree you are planning a very important study in this field. That I have estimated in my first review.

But you have ignored some major aspects of my suggestions in your revision. I this form the study do not be performed. Thus the study protocol should be published.

1. The title should clearly declare the study type! The reproof to the journals section isn’t good enough. The study type also should be identifiable in a PubMed search.
2. In the abstract you don’t mention this limitation (Level 1 studies only). This must declared clearly!
3. Your arguments are acceptable, o.k.
4. o.k.
5. Please be correct! This must be described also in the study protocol.
6. One more. You demonstrates a study protocol! Only patients with specific clinical meniscus tear and not with unspecific knee pain should be included. If you don’t make this differentiation the study is worthlessly. I you feel it unable to do thus, this study protocol shouldn’t be published.
7. accepatable
8. One more! If you perform other “treatments as indicated” should describe your indications!
9. In your final analysis you have to perform a inter-surgeon comparison! But this has tzo declared in the study protocol also.
10. This is inacceptable and a bias to your “treatments as indicated”. Young patients with a buckle-handle” tear should be undergone reconstruction.
11. acceptable

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.