

11 December 2021

Editor in Chief  
World Journal of Orthopedics

Dear Sir:

We are pleased to have been given the chance to revise our manuscript No. 71754, entitled “Risk modeling of femoral neck fracture based on geometric parameters of the proximal epiphysis” for publication in World Journal of Orthopedics.

We also appreciate the constructive comments from the reviewers.

We addressed the reviewer’s comments and revised the manuscript accordingly based on the recommendations and suggestions.

A response to the reviewer’s comments is provided below.

We hope that the revised version, which includes tables and figures, will meet the requirements for publication.

Sincerely,

Yury O Zharikov, MD, PhD, MBA

Associate professor, Department of Human Anatomy,

I.M. Sechenov First Moscow State Medical University (Sechenov University),

8-2 Trubetskaya Street,

Moscow, Russian Federation, 119435

TEL: +7-999-912 – 11-45

Email: [dr\\_zharikov@mail.ru](mailto:dr_zharikov@mail.ru)

**Reviewer #1:**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** This article presents an observational study based on the geometric characteristics of the hip, and the correlation in fracture regeneration. It is obvious that the authors have done a lot of work in the experiment, as well as in the writing.

Thank you for this important comment and the evaluation of our manuscript.

**Reviewer #2:**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The manuscript is rather chaotic and difficult to follow. There are sections: Introduction, Methods, Result, Discussion, Conclusion. Please manage the manuscript accordingly. For example, in this manuscript, there are "introduction" in conclusion section, or "methods" in results section.

Thank you for this important comment.

We took into account your comments and tried to correct the text according to your advice.

According to the comments, we have made changes to the abstract. In the Background section, the authors presented the problem actuality and proposed a hypothesis to solve it. The study restrictions were removed from the "Methods" section to the "Discussion" section. Thus, the abstract has been shortened and easier to understand.

In the introduction and discussion, we indicated the limitations of our study related to its design, sample size and composition.

According to your recommendations, we have made changes to the structure of the article to make it more suitable for the reader. We referred to the description of the research methods in the Methods section and to the results in the Results section. We have removed the section "Measurement of the true parameters of the proximal femur" and referred its contents to the section "Discussion".

We have changed the structure of the "Discussion" section to supplement it with information about the prospects for the application of our research in medicine. We also supplemented the "Discussion" with references of modern methods of femur proximal epiphysis modeling and the application of these models. We added information about the limitations of our study to the "Discussion" section.

According to your recommendations, we have changed the content of the "Conclusion" section and have added information about the possibility of using our study to identify risk groups for hip fracture and to plan surgery interventions.

We also made corrections to the tables and figures presented in our article.