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Reviewer’s report:

The question is well posed by the authors.
Methods are appropriate, but better description should be provided for measurement choices (see comments on averaged measurements).
The reported statistical results should be better explained to make them more understandable (see comment to figure 6).
The manuscripts reports data according to the standards, however statistical results need deeper explanation (see comment to figure 6).
Limitations of the study are stated, however references to literature should be better reported.
The title sounds good, but could be rephrased into a more concise sentence.
The most of the writing is acceptable, nevertheless some paragraphs need to be rephrased and many typos need to be fixed. Some acronyms are not spelled within the text (e.g. THA, OA).

Abstract:
The last sentence of background should be rephrased.
The first sentence of conclusion should be rephrased.

Manuscript

Background:
The two last two sentences should be rephrased to better pitch the aim of the study. The aim of the study should be to assess difference and not to prove it.

Materials and methods:
The second sentence should be rephrased to focus the attention of the reader on the requirements for good quality radiograph.
Statistical analysis included “summarized values”. It should be explained when and why summarized values were chosen.
The last sentence should be moved on the top of materials and methods.

Results:
A table would help reading the results of all measurements. Thus, only statistical considerations should be reported in the text.
When referring to Kellgren and Lawrence classification, the same format for the score should be used as formerly reported in the beginning of results.

Discussion:

Third paragraph, second sentence: the reference to a study as “this” implies an author or a group to be mentioned formerly.

Fifth paragraph: again, the aim of the study should be to assess difference and not to prove it. The all paragraph should be rephrased to be more understandable. See also comments to figure 6.

Seventh paragraph: the explanation of intra- and inter-observer agreement should be highlighted and tightly pitched.

Conclusion:

The first sentence should be rephrased into a more linear shape.

References:

References in English should be preferred.

Figures:

All graphs need to be reported with the individual unit of measure of both x and y axis.

Fig. 1 and 2 go beyond the scope of this article; therefore they can be omitted. Good references should be provided, instead.

Fig. 3: two separate graphs would be better to show left and right measurements, individually.

Fig. 4: The choice of reporting averaged measurements should be explained in the text. Graphs should be consequently labeled (e.g. a, b, etc.) and statistics should be reported accordingly.

Fig. 6: Again, each graph needs to be labeled and statistics should be briefly reported. Of note, the severity groups show substantial overlapping of the values despite statistical significance is reported. Could these results be thoroughly explained?

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

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

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.