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Reviewer's report:

General comments
The authors reported the case of painful knee joint after ACL reconstruction using biodegradable interference screws and usefulness of SPECT/CT for diagnostic tool. Although the manuscript was contained interesting findings, this paper was a little bit redundant as a case report. Please revise manuscript compactly.

Specific comments
Title

Abstract
Since this paper is a case report, abstract should be described more briefly. For example, the first sentence “In the last decades … been reported” and other sentences (detail contents) should be deleted.

Page 2, line 9: “The MRI showed an ACL graft in continuity...” This sentence is vague.

Page 2, line 18: “The interference screws were partially degraded and under palpation a grey fluid-like substance drained at pressure into the joint.” Change to “The interference screws were partially degraded and under palpation and pressure a grey fluid-like substance drained into the joint.”

Page 3, line 3: Change “Due to” to “From”.

Background
As abstract session, detail contents should not be written in introduction (Background). Focus your introduction on the clinical question(s) or hypothesis you intended to address in this case report.

Page 3, line 8: Change “Biodegredable” to “Biodegradable”.

Page 3, line 14: Change “necessitated” to “necessary”.

Page 3, line 15: Spell out ACL

Case report
Page 4, line 14: Change “anterior cruciate ligament (ACL)” to “ACL”.

Page 4, line 12: Change “ACL graft in continuity” to “intact ACL graft”.

Page 5, line 14-: “SPECT” has been already described. Therefore, SPECT should not be spelled out.

Page 5, line 18: “On the femoral side the graft was attached in …”

Page 6, line 1: “drained at with pressure”

Page 6, line 6: like what?

Page 6, line 9: Change “she was with the other one” to “with her right knee”

Conclusions

Conclusion should be changed to “Discussion”.

SPECT/CT is not a routine imaging technique for diagnosing postoperative knee pain. What are the indication and contraindication for similar cases? Is it cost-effective to perform this test on all patients with knee pain? (What are the advantages and disadvantages of SPECT/CT compared to other modalities?)
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