

Peer review minor revisions:

First of all I'd like to emphasize the great you did after the first manuscript. You have achieved writing an article that would be eligible for publication.

Please take the following adjustment into consideration;

INTRODUCTION

Comment 1 (line 44-49):

Take into the considerations the following re-phrasing:

“Athletes usually undergo surgical reconstruction to restore knee stability and function, enabling them to achieve the goal of return to sports after ACL injury after rehabilitation (Keays *et al.* 2022; Swirtun *et al.* 2006; Tashman *et al.* 2008). However, an ACL rupture can have a significant impact on future sports participation and may even mark the end of a promising career (Tashman *et al.* 2008) with an high risk of re-injury (reference p.a.: Rodriquez-Merchan et al ‘Return to sport activities and risk of reinjury following primary anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, Arch Bone Jt Surg, 2022 Aug; 10(8): 648-660).

METHODS

Comment 2 (line 91)

I could be doubtful to mention “ (3) Control: failure in passing RTS testing” in the view of your article search and selection strategy. Is this really your ‘controlgroup’? and how does this show in your data base selection?

Comment 3 (line 94)

Did you really include all study designs? And is this eligible within the PRISMA quideliness of conducting an meta analyse? So also systematic reviews were included? And as I understand you excluded case reports: but would that not be of interest for an hand search? Maybe something for your discussion?

RESULTS

Comment 4 (line 131)

In your reply on this comment you mention:

Question 9: Line 140

You mention ‘irrelevant studies’: could you be more specific?

Response: Thanks for this suggestion, and irrelevant studies including articles reported other topics, patients at other disease status, did not investigated role of RTS testing, and reported other outcomes.

Response: Could you take into consideration to rephrase ‘irrelevant studies’ by ‘not fitting the inclusion criteria’

Comment 5 (line 133)

Here you mention excluding articles because of being an review (n=8). This is inconsistent with my comment 3.

DISCUSSION

In general I find it hard to view the discussion with finding the common thread in what you are trying to emphasize on behalf of your findings. Maybe you could work with 'headers' to make it more readability? You are willing to emphasize the insistent findings, true?

Comment 6 (line 204)

Please take into consideration rephrasing 'passing **the** RTS test and the outcomes of knee injury' to 'passing **the** RTS test and the likelihood OR predictive value of sustaining an knee injury

Comment 7 (line 213)

In my opinion the following sentences 'Moreover, **passing an** RTS test **by athletes is** associated with a reduced risk of graft rupture. **In addition**, the role of passing **an** RTS test **may be influenced by the specific** study design, country, percentage **of males included**, and **the** study quality.' Is not appropriate within the point of discussion you are trying to make. Above that: isn't 'graft rupture' definition the same as 'secondary ACL rupture'?

Comment 8 (line 217-218)

Relevance?

Comment 9 (line 230-234)

Did you change the timeline of inclusion? In other words: what did you do differently / better than the study of Webster et al making your study results more relevant?