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Reviewer's report:

Overall the text is too wordy and needs a thoroughly rewriting to be shortened and clarified. The text needs to be coherent in its use of grammar and spelling. I recommend the use of a professional proofreader and I recommend the use of a more classical scientifically nomenclature; mean/median instead of average, postoperatively instead of after surgery etc.

The study reports there results with the Journey knee a BCS TKR.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
1.1. The study has to aims; well-being and the correlation between function and patient reported outcome (PRO). However they have only a hypothesis regarding correlations of outcome. However the study almost exclusively reports the results, and leaves little focus on the lag of correlation.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
2.1. Materials and Methods paragraph three: The inclusion and treatment needs to be clarified. As I read understand the text; From August 2008 to May 2011 113 consecutive patients were treated with primary BCS TKR. Fourteen patients (12.4%) were subsequent excluded, and had revision surgery. If this is the case, then it is catastrophic and the most interesting result in the text. If this is the case I recommend the study to be published without unnecessary delays

3. Are the data sound?
3.1. The study needs to present its data in a proper way. First of all are the data normal distributed?

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
4.1. Before clarifying of point 2 and 3, this cannot be answered.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
5.1 Before clarifying of point 2 and 3, this cannot be answered.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building,
both published and unpublished?
7. 1 Yes
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
  8.1 That depends on point 2
9. Is the writing acceptable?
  9.1. See my overall remarks.

The level of interest and my recommendation regarding publication depends on point two. I therefore wish to have this clarified before I comment on that.

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

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

**Statistical review:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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