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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions:
The manuscript reports the results of 26 knees and 21 patients. I suggest to include only the first knee that underwent surgery. There is no sense in reporting on two knees in the same patient.

The number of patients/knees is rather limited regarding the midterm FU and there are larger studies published. Furthermore the patient pool is rather heterogenous regarding defect size, FTA and metal augment.

It was stated in the introduction that the study was retrospective while the discussion starts with...."We performed a prospective study...". What was study design?

Is there any further information regarding cementation technique (e.g. tourniquet use, type and viscosity of cement, vacuum mixing, pulsed lavage, hand packing etc.). If so, this must be added to the methods section, as a large number of radioluencies was observed, which could be partially explained by cementing technique.

How many patients were available at latest FU radiographic and clinical ? Is there a difference in FU times ? Any patients lost to FU ? If so, this must be stated.

The JOA knee score is rarely used to assess TKA function. I recommend to provide commonly applied scores like Knee Society Scores to allow comparision with other publications in the literature.

Minor Essential Revisions:
One could argue if a kaplan maier curve is helpful with a small number of patients and only three patients being revised during FU.

Discretionary Revisions:
There are some minor language flaws in the manuscript.

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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