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ABSTRACT

The author was able to make all necessary changes to the Abstract

INTRODUCTION

We commend the authors in making some great adjustments to the introduction

METHODS

1. Inter-rater reliability - the following reference could be used

2. I thank the author for their justification for the use of tests in each battery, the ACL-RSI and KOOS QoL as a psychological outcome measure. Couple of minor comments in relation to this new content:
   - The justification for the use of the KOOS and ACL-RSI as a psychological measure would be better placed in the PROs section above. You have used all PROs in the batteries therefore specific justification of why one is included or not is not required here.
   - The sentence regarding the ACL-RSI justification - what is meant by the "highest methodological quality"? I don't think this sentence is necessarily needed - you could add something to the section above saying that it was designed specifically for ACL-injured athletes.
   - In regard to the justification of the 5MF and 2MF tests - I think it would be worth reporting the 5MF first, and then stating 2 "clinician friendly" tests (i.e minimal equipment, cost or training required compared to isokinetic testing) were chosen from this battery - the vertical hop and hop for distance. This will link to your conclusions better, and get the reader thinking about the implications of your results.
RESULTS

I commend the author on making necessary adjustments

DISCUSSION

"When 5 MF tests with or without 2 PROs were used, the passing rate, compared with only 2 hop tests, the passing rates decreased from 47% to approximately 29% and 13%, respectively."

I maintain that the order of 29% and 13% is incorrect -

5 MF tests with 2 PROs according to in text (Line 178) and in figure 2 =13%
5 MF tests (without 2 PROs) according to in text (Line 177 and 180) and in figure 2 = 29%

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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