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Reviewer's report:

The present article is a systematic review on the genetic basis of rotator cuff injury. It presents interesting results about different loci that may be involved. The introduction and methods are well structured, but Results and Discussion need to be modified, I recommend a series of modifications in each one of the sections that must be done before their acceptance.

In the Background section:

1. I do not understand the use of reference 3 in the first paragraph. I recommend that they explain it better or eliminate it.

2. Lack of reference on the data provided by "of about the time from the onset of symptoms to the loss of function". They need to include the appropriate reference.

In Results:

1. They select a total of 13 studies that are detailed in figure 1, but in figure 1, only 12. They have to coincide.

2. In point 3.1 indicate 10 studies present in table 1, and in the table there are 12.

3. If you select 13 studies because they only have 10 or 12? Nothing is clear and it is essential that they explain it well.

4. In point 3.2, the values of the Harvei et al study presented do not coincide with those in the table.

In Discussion:

It is too long and dense, with few conclusions. Recommends that it be shortened and rewritten more clearly.

In all test they must review the written punctuation marks.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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