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Guy Trudel, Hans K Uhthoff, Louis Goudreau and Odette Laneuville BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders Research article

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   Spontaneous recovery of knee function in an experimental flexion contraction model was studied. In this rat model this is well studied. However in the whole manuscript there is a lot of description of the clinical human situation. The authors should stick to the description of the rat model and only briefly discuss the possible human consequences in the Discussion section.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   Yes, clear description of the model and nice illustrations.

3. Are the data sound?
   Yes, clear statistical section; table 1 sufficient. No inconsistency of data.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   Yes, well balanced manuscript with clear paragraphs; figures easy to interpret.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   No, the main problem with the discussion and the whole manuscript is that this animal experiment and human clinical data are mixed. The authors should stick to there animal experiment and report the consequences with other experiments with rats (immobilization and fracture healing f.i.). Only briefly in the discussion section they could discuss the possible clinical human consequences.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   Yes, but more emphasis on the rat experiment and much less on humans.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, very little is know on this subject.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
No, the introduction is completely about the human situation and not the rat experiment.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
No, Major Compulsory Revision is warranted.
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