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Reviewer's report:

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

The manuscript is in an under-investigated area of DLM tears. It has a small N, but decent for such a rare disease entity.

There are some areas where the manuscript could be improved for the reader.

Abstract:

please provide p-value for "patient with younger age were associated". it is hard to tell if the word associated is a significant finding.

similarly, provide p-value for ...some were not associated.

Introduction:

studies related to PRP should be updated and more specific to the meniscus when available. the PRP paper relating to general concepts of PRP are very outdated, and there are many more meniscus ex vivo/in vitro/animal model studies that could be tied in as opposed to a completely different system like rotator cuff.

you hypothesized that PRP would be beneficial...but beneficial for repair, but that doesn't really tell the ready what you mean...please expand on what you mean.

for the PRP preparation, it is very good that you measured both platelets and leukocytes. please report the range and std dev to go along with the mean.

what volume of PRP did you deliver? in your figure, it looked like the clot was proud to the meniscal surface. what was your operative technique with filling the clot?
the statistical methods is questionable. You have two time frames and performing multiple t tests instead of including time as a variable in something like a GLM increases the chance for a type I error. Further, please add what data were considered continuous and what data were considered categorical. Finally, in the results, a multivariate analysis is mentioned, but this is not mentioned in the statistical methods section.

Discussion:

Paragraph 2 information would be better placed in the introduction. The discussion would be more meaningful if the authors focused on comparing and contrasting their results with meniscus papers, even if not DLM, focusing again on PRP papers related to the meniscus would be more meaningful than trying to relate your findings to other musculoskeletal systems.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

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.

I recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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