

Answers to reviewers

Reviewer 1

1. I suggest authors add a list of abbreviations at the end of the manuscript.
All abbreviations are addressed in the manuscript. Where abbreviations are used in tables, they are explained at the end of the table.
2. Throughout the manuscript, the titles of tables should be at the top.
This is rectified.
3. The Introduction section is poorly written. The authors should explain more about fractures, especially ankle fractures.
More points are added to the introduction section.

Reviewer 2

1. The sample size is very small and cannot be a criterion for judgment
The data is collected from 22 years of prospectively collated data. We could only identify 37 patients in our database who meet the eligibility criteria.
2. Entry and exit criteria are not considered in this study
It is mentioned in the materials and methods section that ' All patients older than 70 years with an open ankle fracture requiring surgical intervention were identified'.
3. Many confounding factors such as gender, underlying diseases, lifestyle (smoking, Alcohol,), and metabolic diseases can affect the clinical outcome.
We found no gender differences in the type of ankle fracture sustained or in the incidence of complications. Comparison is explained in table 2. We do not include life style and metabolic diseases in this age group due to lack of data.