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In this month’s JBJS article “Anterior Cruciate Ligament Repair: The Current Status”, by Drs Hughes, Lawton, Nawabi, Pearle and Musahl, on page 1911, the authors state “An ongoing non-randomized cohort study has been comparing the BEAR procedure with ACL reconstruction using autograft hamstring” and they attach reference 67 to that statement. The title of reference 67 as listed in the bibliography is “Bridge-enhanced anterior cruciate ligament repair is not inferior to autograft anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction at 2 years: results of a prospective randomized clinical trial”. Reference 67 is indeed a 100-patient prospective randomized clinical trial that had 96% follow-up at 2 years (Level of evidence: 1) which demonstrated outcomes for repairs performed with a specific tissue-engineered implant were comparable to ACL reconstruction. It is not a non-randomized cohort study as the current text suggests. In the vein of providing complete transparency for you and your readership, the complete publication is open access and available at the following link: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0363546520913532 . While I am confident this error was made innocently, I would be most grateful if it could be corrected promptly.

Thank you for your consideration.
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Article Author(s) to Letter Writer(s)

We would like to apologize for our oversight on this matter. The statement regarding a non-randomized cohort study was in reference to the other referenced study (Number 14) by the same authors. We apologize for the confusion.