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Reviewer's report:

Overall Comments:

Overall, this paper has interesting information and with considerable revisions should be accepted for publication.

Specific comments:

The concept of proprioception needs to be included when this author describes the advantages of bicruciate retaining implants.

On the methodology portion of the abstract on the paper they need to clarify why where so many knees excluded. The concept of "Patient base outcome" needs to be described better.

On line 31 to 34 they stated that 113 consecutive patients were treated by primary BCS TKR implanted by a single surgeon then they go on to say that fourteen patients were excluded, twelve due to serious medial or lateral ligament instability. Did this occur before surgery? Were they not using a BCS TKR in this fourteen patients or did they use the BCS TKR in this patients and they had to revise it? This is most important and this needs to be described. Did they change the plan intraoperatively or did they change because they noticed the clinical finding in surgery? Did they damage the media or lateral ligament while preparing the knee for bicruciate total knee replacement? This has to be clarified and it is a key portion of the study.

They need to describe the sizes of the inserts.

On the result section they need to describe the complications that they had. In how many did the island pull out? They also need to describe the number of months of follow up that they had on each one of their knees. A table with the average of follow up in the different scales needs to be included.

The discussion again proprioception needs to be highlighted, this is one of the key issues with retaining the ligaments.

On line 10 to 12 on the discussion they quote a paper that was presented and not published. If they are going to quote that paper they need to describe some of the complications described on that paper.
Most readers do not have access to that information and it is the most important point on their discussion.

In the summary on lines 28 to 33 they need to include the complication rate, technical complication rate and clinical complication rate.

The diagram included does not really help the readers, that needs to be removed and the table 1 does not help either. The correlations are terrible they do not add to the paper.

On the additional files the writer with the submission this reviewer cannot find additional information that those that was in the paper.
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