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Reviewer's report:

General
Much improved in clarity. Statistical analysis now in keeping with study design (two group analysis).

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
Abstract:
Wording and sentence structure needs review (particularly 'Methods')
Discussion:
Again, wording and sentence structure is poor (particularly 'Comparisons with other studies'.

Your point around Figure 3 is not logical - Fig 3 demonstrate that are fairly comparable number of individuals in both the exercise and the control group improved. You need to drop this discussion point.

I cannot see where you are going with paragraph 2 (p12). What point are you trying to make?

I would drop the last paragraph in the discussion section. There was no improvement in the control group for any of the KOOS main outcome measures. In fact deterioration was demonstrated.

Conclusion: Drop last sentence as Fig 3 shows that it was also possible to benefit from being allocated to the 'no exercise' group.

Table 3: Information in title about scoring of PCS and MCS should go in the text (Methods section)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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