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Reviewer's report:

General
The question of how to make a diagnose of ruptured ACL is very important. I agree with the authors that the surgical decision of the ACL reconstruction should depend on clinical examination and symptoms. The MRI is only a helping tool when making the surgical decision. However, it is not always easy to make clinically this diagnose, especially in an acute knee trauma. Therefore, one should repeat the clinical examination one or two weeks after the primary knee trauma rather than do the diagnostic arthroscopy of the knee, as the authors suggested. This issue should be discussed more in this article. However, at the beginning of the ACL reconstruction, the rupture of the ACL, of course, has to be defined arthroscopically.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Minor Compulsory Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
The figures were not good at quality.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
The sample size of this article was quite small when comparing the earlier sample sizes seen in the literature. Also, the study was carried on already between 1996 and 1998. Was the MRI examination then as good and reliable than nowadays? In addition, the ratio results of the three radiologists were quite different (from 50 % to 82 %). What was the experience of these radiologists? See also the comments in General Section concerning the importance of repeating clinical examination when comparing the diagnostic knee arthroscopy.

Advice on publication: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: A paper whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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