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Reviewer's report:

Overall Purpose:
The presented study handles an interesting topic with a well performed methodology. Unfortunately line numbers are missing which makes the review rather difficult.

Abstract:
No correction or comments.

Introduction:
Well written introduction with a clear concept.

Materials and Methods:
Page 8: About what kind of instability do you talk (ant.inf. traumatic? Multidirectional? Also subluxations) – Please add definition for inclusion criteria!

Page 8: “’Exclusion criteria…” – please define glenoid or proximal humeral fracture. Is a bony bankart already a glenoid fracture – what about large Hill Sachs (humeral fracture?).

Page 10: Why didn’t you also use the self assessment Rowe score? Please also add an explanation in “Discussion”.

Page 11: (OSS):
Please shorten paragraph : “In the original scoring system ….” like according to the OSIS the scoring system was revised to 0 to 48 points.

Page 14:
Did you ask the patient if within the time interval from first questionnaire anything happened (redislocation, subluxation) – this might change the whole scoring. Especially when in about 10% the last dislocation was less than a month ago there might be a few incidents in this time interval.

Results:
Well written.

Page 17: All patients suffered anterior dislocations – so this was an inclusion criteria?

Discussion:
Page 22: Please add numbers for references (Kirkley, Hatta, Salomonsson, Hoffstaetter, …)!

Page 22, last line: we decided to use the OSIS, …! There is no argumentation why. Please add.

Page 24: The homogeneity of the group is to discuss – one positive point is only ant.inf. dislocations but also early instability osteoarthritis has to be discussed in the patients with longer than 2 years dislocation ago. For these DASH or OSS might be more suitable (pain vs instability).

Overall conclusion:
The presented study is well designed and the paper well written. It additionally adds knowledge to current literature so that I would consider the article for publication after the above mentioned revisions.

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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