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Reviewer's report:

This is a well written paper with a solid methods section. It provides an interesting insight into the issues of people returning to sport following ACL reconstruction.

I only have two comments that I think the authors could address to strengthen the paper.

I think it would be helpful to include in the limitations that you have not comprehensively assess the somatosensory system. Thus, while psychological factors may be the underlying reason for a person not being ready to return to sport - it maybe that their somatosensory system has not fully recovered.

I also note that the rate of participants exercising at the higher level at 1 year post op was inverse to the preop level. It would be interesting to know if there was a correlation between level of participation and the battery of tests. While I accept that is was not the primary outcome, it would provide further evidence for your findings.

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.

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.
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