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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written manuscript with a clear objective and findings. It is limited by the small size and non-retrospective nature which is identified in the discussion. I would support publication following minor essential revisions.

1. Would re-word the sentence, “In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain, weakness, satisfaction with the outcome of the surgery, and complications were recorded.”

To read, “In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain and weakness were evaluated. In addition satisfaction with the outcome of the surgery and complications were records.

2. Please identify when patients satisfaction was evaluated. You indicate that their satisfaction was recorded twice and it is hard to understand what is the difference between these two assessments. How is the outcome of their surgery different from their overall post-operative result? Are these the same or do they address different time points?

“In the physical evaluation, ROM, pain, weakness, satisfaction with the outcome of the surgery, and complications were recorded. Finally, patients were asked their overall satisfaction with the postoperative result...”

3. Would change wording of your conclusion from, “In conclusion, anatomical reduction the AC joint and biomechanical reconstruction CC ligaments are crucial for the optimal joint stability and function. Two tunnel CC reconstruction with an allogenic ST graft provides satisfactory radiographic and clinical results compared to single-tunnel reconstruction technique.”

To, “In conclusion, anatomical reduction the AC joint and biomechanical reconstruction CC ligaments are crucial for the optimal joint stability and function. Two tunnel CC reconstruction with an allogenic ST graft provides superior radiographic and clinical results compared to single-tunnel reconstruction technique.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.