

Dears Editors and Reviewers at World Journal of Orthopedics

We would like to take this opportunity to thank the reviewers and the managing editor for their careful review of our study. By attending to your comments that were helpful; we believe that our manuscript has improved significantly. We have carefully considered the comments of the reviewers and the managing editor and we would like to respond to them point by point as follow:

Dear Editor - Thank you for reviewing our study

We edited the manuscript by a professional company for the language and we re-organize the discussion.

Regarding the follow-up period; the last follow-up visit was in January- March 2020 and it was the time were the last X-ray and clinical exam was done. We added this to the text.

We added more information to the methodology section:

“Patients were scheduled for follow-up visits; the follow-up period was customized according to patient cases individually, with a timeframe ranging from a month postoperatively to one year.”

“All fractures were also assessed by altering their Baumann angle, which was measured both postoperatively and during the last follow-up in January-March 2020”

And we added to the result section this sentence:

“The mean time for last follow-up was 24.65 and 20.55 months in the lateral pinning and cross pinning groups, respectively.”

Dear reviewer #1 – Thank you for reviewing our study

Point one thank you for your words regarding our study

Question one “There was not enough evidence to draw conclusion “equal biomechanical stability” between the two configurations.”

We agree with your point; our data did not address the biomechanical stability that was mentioned in our conclusion. Since biomechanical stability was the conclusion drawn from previous studies as Chen T et al. (24) and Hamdi A et al. (25), therefore we removed it from the conclusion.

Question two and three

“The sample size of cross pin group was relatively small. There were significant different numbers or ratio for the fracture types between two groups. ”

as mentioned in the limitation section, randomized controlled trial, involving larger samples and evenly distributed cases with long-term follow-up, is warranted in future studies.

Retrospective talking, we think the surgeons at our institute believed the cross pinning would add more stability to fracture type 4 due to lack of established evidence in that matter and that contributed to the apparent difference in number.

Question four

“How long did each group follow-up? “

Regarding the follow-up period; the last follow-up visit was in January- March 2020 and it was the time were the last X-ray and clinical exam was done. We added this to the text.

We added more information to the methodology section:

“Patients were scheduled for follow-up visits; the follow-up period was customized according to patient cases individually, with a timeframe ranging from a month postoperatively to one year.”

“All fractures were also assessed by altering their Baumann angle, which was measured both postoperatively and during the last follow-up in January-March 2020”

And we added to the result section this sentence:

“The mean time for last follow-up was 24.65 and 20.55 months in the lateral pinning and cross pinning groups, respectively.”

Dear reviewer #2 – Thank you for reviewing our study

Point one thank you for your words regarding our study

Question one “There was not enough evidence to draw conclusion “equal biomechanical stability” between the two configurations.”

We agree with your point; our data did not address the biomechanical stability that was mentioned in our conclusion. Since biomechanical stability was the conclusion drawn from previous studies as Chen T et al(24) and Hamdi A et al(25), therefore we removed it from the conclusion.

Question two and three

“The sample size of cross pin group was relatively small. There were significant different numbers or ratio for the fracture types between two groups. ”

as mentioned in the limitation section, randomized controlled trial, involving larger samples and evenly distributed cases with long-term follow-up, is warranted in future studies.

Retrospective talking, we think the surgeons at our institute believed the cross pinning would add more stability to fracture type 4 due to lack of established evidence in that matter and that contributed to the apparent difference in number.

Question four

“How long did each group follow-up? “

Regarding the follow-up period; the last follow-up visit was in January- March 2020 and it was the time were the last X-ray and clinical exam was done. We added this to the text.

We added more information to the methodology section:

“Patients were scheduled for follow-up visits; the follow-up period was customized according to patient cases individually, with a timeframe ranging from a month postoperatively to one year.”

“All fractures were also assessed by altering their Baumann angle, which was measured both postoperatively and during the last follow-up in January-March 2020”

And we added to the result section this sentence:

“The mean time for last follow-up was 24.65 and 20.55 months in the lateral pinning and cross pinning groups, respectively.”

Sincerely,

Ahmad Radaideh,

Corresponding Author