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**Reviewer’s report:**

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   There was no question posed by the authors.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   No. The authors didn’t describe the “functional, biomechanical and strength tests” used at their biomechanical study to evaluate if their “New concept of scapholunate dissociation treatment” and their “novel modification of Brunelli procedure” provide a stable and lasting reconstruction of the reconstructed scapholunate ligament.

3. Are the data sound?
   The only reported data were “The presented method, according to the above mentioned scheme, withstanded the strength of 5 kg with no sings of scapholunate dissociation or rotatory subluxation of the scaphoid” and “At the 50-60° of wrist flexion, the place of suturing FCR to itself was interrupted in all cases.” Sorry, it is absolutely unclear how the authors collected these data.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Absolutely not. This manuscript is fare away to present a scientific paper.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   Absolutely not. As mentioned above there are only 2 concrete data presented. But it is absolutely unclear with which method these data were measured.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   No.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   No, neither the English nor the kind of writing at all. This is far away to be a
scientific paper.

**Level of interest:** An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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