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Author's response to reviews:

Dear Editors,

Dear Reviewers,

Thank you very much for your interest in our manuscript. We appreciate your
time and effort. Your valuable comments have gladly been incorporated into the
manuscript. The following constitutes a point-by-point response to the comments
by the reviewers:

Reviewer 1

Thank you for mentioning further relevant literature.

Discussion

1. The study from Aebli et al. had already been incorporated into the manuscript
   (lines 204-206).
2. The other three studies are now integrated in the discussion (lines 206-212).

Reviewer 2

Thank you very much for an outstanding review! Due to your thoughtful
comments, the manuscript has gained substantially more value.

Abstract

1. Corrected as suggested (line 14).
2. Corrected as suggested (lines 20-22). However, “variables” were used instead
   of parameters to follow the chosen terms of the remaining manuscript.
3. Corrected as suggested (lines 26-27).

Introduction
5. Corrected as suggested (lines 49-50).
6. Corrected as suggested (lines 63-65).
7. Corrected as suggested (line 67).
8. Corrected as suggested (line 68).
9. Corrected as suggested (line 70).
10. Corrected as suggested (line 75).
11. Corrected as suggested (line 78).
12. Corrected as suggested (lines 79-82).

Methods
13. Corrected as suggested (lines 97-100ff).
14. Corrected as suggested (lines 101-104).
15. Corrected as suggested (lines 104-106ff).
17. Corrected as suggested (lines 106-110).
18. Corrected as suggested (111-114).
19. Corrected as suggested (lines 114-117).
20. Corrected as suggested (lines 142-144).

Results
22. Corrected as suggested (lines 178-180).

Discussion
23. Corrected as suggested (lines 185-186).
24. Corrected as suggested (lines 186-190).
25. We have opted to leave “acceptable” because, by definition, “good” would indicate higher Lysholm scores than 80 (i.e. between 84-90) (lines 190-192).
27. Corrected as suggested (lines 215-218).
28. Corrected as suggested (lines 252-254).
29. Corrected as suggested (lines 257-258).
31. Corrected as suggested (lines 273-274).
32. Corrected as suggested (lines 275-278).
33. Corrected as suggested (lines 280-281).
34. Corrected as suggested (lines 296-297).
Conclusions
35. Corrected as suggested (lines 303-306).

Figures and table, legends:
36. Corrected as suggested (page 18, second paragraph).
37. Corrected as suggested (page 18, fourth paragraph).
38. Corrected as suggested (lines 97-100ff).

Note

Thank you very much.

All the best,
The authors