

Reviewer #1

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

The author should provide two examples and should include figures.

We agree with the opinion that examples such as figures will improve the reader's understandings and provided each example using PFN and PFNA as figures. Thank you for the comment.

Results: Union rate in both groups not mentioned. The clinical outcome should start with union in both groups, union time, function followed by surgical time and mortality.

Thank you for your comment. Since we described the union rate and union time as the radiographic evaluation in the materials and methods part, these two measurements still remained in the 'radiographic outcomes' section in the Results part. And tables 2 and 3 were also modified accordingly. However, if the editor and the reviewer insist that they should be placed in the 'clinical outcomes' instead of 'radiographic results' section, we will revise this according to the recommendation in next revision.

Table: The table showing complications in both groups is empty. Which complications have been evaluated?

There seems to have been a mistake in the file upload process. We evaluated screw cutout, nonunion, infection, osteonecrosis of femoral head, and implant breakage as complications. We also revised Table 4.

Science editor's comment

The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the proximal femoral nail antirotation. The topic is within the scope of the WJO. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is an interesting case, and the manuscript is well written. However, there are some issues should be addressed. Union rate in both groups not mentioned. The author should provide two examples and should include figures. Which complications have been evaluated? The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 4 tables. A total of 29 references are cited, including 2 references published in the last 3 years. There is 1 self-citation. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Enago was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, the Institutional Review Board Approval Form, and the informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJO. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. 5 Issues raised:

(1) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

Thank you for the kind comment. We thoroughly revised reference to provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers.

(2) I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

As suggested, we added "article highlights" section at the end of the main test.

(3) The author should number the references in Arabic numerals according to the citation order in the text. The reference numbers will be superscripted in square brackets at the end of the sentence with the citation content or after the cited author's name, with no spaces.

As suggested, we revised the entire references in manuscript following the journal's policy. Thank you.

6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Editorial Office Director's comment

: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

Company Editor-in-Chief's comment

: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Thank you for the valuable comments from the reviewers. All comments raised from the reviewers improved our manuscript much better. We are hoping that this revised manuscript may fulfill the high standard of the journal.