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The optimal surgical treatment method for anterior cruciate ligament rupture: results from a network meta-analysis

**General Recommendation:** Good - publish after minor revision

**Comments to Editor:**
There is great need to stress main idea of this article. Discussion is difficult to read and understand. Should be more clear. After conclusions still unclear about the message sent by authors

**Comments to Author:**
The article should be revised. Its unclear main idea about this article. Is it about outcomes analysis or optimal treatment for ACL rupture

**Title and abstract**
All analysis was done about outcomes after different types of ACL surgeries. If authors use combinantion "optimal treatment" this must be stressed through all article.

**Introduction**
Authors need to stress about they are not focused about professionals sportsman.

**Material and Methods**
need to add some data. How many studies were prospective? And treatment outcomes were evaluated in different studies? This detail can directly affect outcome scores.

**Statistical Analysis**
Done correctly.

**Results**
Everything clear.

**Discussion**
Difficult to understand about best outcome treatment option.

**Conclusions**
Unclear. "Primary repair may be an ideal treatment method in terms of efficacy but is related to a significantly higher revision risk."
So it's the best or no?

**Tables and Graphics**
Everything clear.

**References**
Nothing to add.

**General comments to the Authors**
The article should be revised. It's unclear main idea about this article. Is it about outcomes analysis or optimal treatment for ACL rupture?