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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript contains interesting information. There are a few uncertainties that need clarification and some minor errors. The study is labelled ‘case-control’ It is hard to see that one Group could serve as a Control since they had different treatment based on differences in their anatomy. I would suggest that this subtitle is removed. In the first line of the background section the abbreviation RC occurs without any explanation. The incidence numbers of full thickness rotator cuff ruptures varies in the literature and there are more references that might be relevant to this statement. The main concern is however the section ‘patient enrolment’ which is unclear to the extent that one of the reviewers even believed that the study had been a prospective randomized one. The authors state at the end of the discussion that this was no the case but it should be clearly expressed that it was a retrospective examination of patients having undergone rotator cuff repair and - to my understanding - these patients fell into two different categories; one Group operated with simultaneous subacromial decompression and the other Group without. The decision of the decompression was apparently made based on the presence of type III acromion shape and appreciated subacromial space reduction. This may of course result in inclusion bias which should be acknowledged and discussed. The factors leading the surgeon to perform the decompression may in fact illustrate differences between the treatment Groups. Presumably the post hoc analysis was based on a primary outcome variable? This should then be described.

Apart from these remarks the study is of interest.

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.

Yes
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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