Title: Risk factors for cranial cruciate ligament rupture in dogs participating in canine agility

Version: 1 **Date:** 10 Nov 2021

Reviewer's report:

Thank you for producing this very interesting and relevant study. It is a remarkably understudied area and your study will certainly help to fill this gap in the literature and poses many interesting future questions. I enjoyed reading it very much.

I have a few general comments and then some more specific comments:

1) This study would not be ethical review exempt in our Institution and I think you need to at least talk about getting these participants to give their consent and show how you did this on your questionnaire. An example of the actual questionnaire and how it was laid out would be useful in the Supplementary material. More information on how you stored and processed the data and how this was aligned with GDPR would be useful again related to owner consent.

2) CCLI as described in your paper, does not have the same aetiology I suspect as CCLD/R and I think this need to be much clearer in their potential differences in the Introduction, Discussion and Conclusion. Have all of these dogs had surgical management of their CCLI or how have they been diagnosed? I think this needs to be much clearer in your methods.

Specific comments:

typographical error ? - line 41

Abstract:
line 50- CCLI- not really commonly used in the literature- it is usually CCLD/R.I agree that within this population it may be CCLI but this is not well reported so should probably not be used in reference to the previous literature.
Lines 58-64- I think more specific detail on odds ratios should be added.
Line 68: yes I agree in this population but it is different to the CCLD/R group. As above in general comments.

Introduction:
Lines 77- 84-I think you need to define the difference here with CCLI vs CCLD/R.
lines 90- 96- suggest include more references.
Line 97- what is your hypothesis?
line 104- link to this software or example in appendix?
Liness 103- 112- what was this questionnaire based on? any previous work? had it been validated? Why is this questionnaire exempt from ethical review as you are collecting data from clients on their dogs? It would be a requirement to have ethical review for this type of study in the UK/EU.
Lines 114-118- were there any exclusion criteria?

Line 126- ok but how did the owners give their consent to give their data/responses. Also did you collect the data anonymously straightaway or how did you store the data?

Results

Table 1- dog BCS- ? how was this different as the data presented here look the same. They are not of course I assume but this is not very clear on how you got these results. So might be good to see the spread of the data.

Discussion

Line 391- reference for this?