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Reviewer's report:

Many thanks for submitting the second revision of your manuscript.

Please let me express my appreciation for your acknowledging the suggestions I had indicated in my previous correspondence. I am also pleased that the external statistical consultation may have contributed to an improvement of the underlying data analysis.

Although the interesting topic of utility values in ACL-insufficient population will need further researching and application in the clinical setting, the authors have laid the foundations for evaluation of the impact of ACL intervention from an original perspective. This could play a role in health economics analysis in future research, which might appeal to third-party payers for example. I wish they could provide data obtained from a patient sample in future clinical research of theirs.

I have no further recommendations to the authors short of a minor essential revision due to:

1. the persistence of a duplicated set of figures in the manuscript I have received. I am aware you have re-uploaded the manuscript but the problem is still there. I have made the Editorial board aware of that through an e-mail

2. a minor linguistic revision to refine their manuscript. For example the sentence (page 5, line 7 of the Methods section): “From those, the subjective knee evaluation and knee examination forms are preferred in use by researchers” is not very clear to me.

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: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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