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Reviewer's report:

General Comments

This study aims to investigate the effect of operated and non-operated leg at 60 degrees/s and 180 degrees/s on angle-specific isokinetic contraction of the quadriceps and hamstrings in patients after ACL-reconstruction. This method is very well structured using an original statistical approach (SPM) to determine over the ROM were the torque or HQ ratio are statistically different. A major drawback of this study is that the protocol has not been tested on healthy control matched by age, sex and BMI. Moreover, I suspect that male and female participants are significantly different in Torque and Power. The authors must run a statistical analyses to verify wether the sex has significant difference in the measured variables. If male and female are significantly difference in the measured variables then the authors must consider to analysis male and female separately.

Specific comments

The authors must add a table on the participant demographics by including sex, age, height, weight, sports and IKDC.

The authors should clarify the sentence "A good to high reliability..." what was it? test -retest?

Clarify how and why the repetitions have been discarded by the two investigators. How they agree to discard a repetition?

Clarify the SPM analysis, what was the post analysis ?

In the text, you should use operated and non-operated not injured leg (page 10 line 21)

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.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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