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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions

REVISIONS REQUESTED

1. It seemed inappropriate to number lines individually in each page. Numbering lines from starting page to end will ease to read the manuscript.

2. All abbreviations should be spelled out in first use. For example, the statement on the line 10 in the page 4 should be revised as “total knee replacement (TKR)”.

3. “Total Knee Arthroplasty (TKA)” is more widely used worldwide. Thus, it should be more appropriate to use TKA rather than TKR.

4. The manuscript should be reviewed for spelling errors. For example, the word “prostheses” on the line 13 in the page 4 should be revised as “prosthesis”.

5. Did all 99 patients undergo unilateral surgery? Weren’t there any patient underwent bilateral surgery or did authors select unilateral knees intentionally? If so, this should be mentioned in the patient selection criteria.

6. The reference 23 cited on the line 14 in the page 5 seems pointless since the reference 24 seems sufficient.

7. The lines 25-34 in the page 5 should be supported by a reference.

8. References should be reviewed. For example, page numbers are missing for reference 2. Authors should observe spelling.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests.

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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