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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear sir,
I am sending back the article according to your revision sent me last June 23rd.
Best wishes,

Fabio Teruo Matsunaga
Departamento de Ortopedia e Traumatologia - UNIFESP
Rua Borges de Lagoa, 783 — 5o andar
São Paulo (SP) — Brasil —CEP 04038-032
Tel./Fax (+55 11) 5571-6621
E-mail: fteruo@gmail.com

Abstract:
1. The last sentence in the Methods paragraph was omitted.
2. The end of the last sentence in the Results paragraph is now read, "..., which showed poor concordance and the least reproducibility."
3. A conclusion paragraph was inserted at the end of the abstract.

Introduction:
1. This section is now titled INTRODUCTION.
2. Paragraph #3 was moved to the end of paragraph #1 and paragraph #4 was to the end of paragraph #2.
3. The 2nd sentence in paragraph #2 is now read, "Therefore, proper classification is essential in order to render the proper treatment."
4. In paragraph #6, the 1st sentence is now read, "In 1997, Hotchkiss modified the Mason classification by correlating fracture type with the proper intervention."
5. In paragraph #7, the end of the 2nd sentence is now read, "...serves as a basis for treatment and prognosis."
6. In paragraph #7, the last sentence is now read, "While this system is the most comprehensive, its intra- and inter-observer reproducibility has shown to be limited."
7. Paragraph #8 was revised and references were inserted.

Methods:
1. In paragraph #1, the end of the 1st sentence is now read, "..., who were not evaluators of concordance."
2. In paragraph #4, some modifications were made to explain better that the observers classified each xray according to 3 different classification systems at 3 different times.
3. In the last paragraph, references were included for Fleiss et al. and Scott and Cohen.

Results:
1. In the last paragraph, the end of the last sentence is now read, "..., and these were larger than those for the other classifications and were satisfactory."

Discussion:
1. Paragraphs #2 and #3 were combined to one single paragraph.
2. In paragraph #2, the start of the 2nd sentence is now read, "The broad variability in these results is probably due to..."
3. In paragraph #4, the word "conditioning" was replaced with "learning curve that exists", as in #5, at the end of the 1st sentence.
4. In paragraph #5, a sentence was included to discuss AO/ASIF classification system complexity probably resulting in less concordance.
5. In paragraph #7, the 1st sentence is now read, "... this study was limited to assessment of the correlation between and within the observers, ..."

6. A last paragraph was created to discuss the need of new studies until an ideal classification is created.

Conclusion:
1. Mason and Morrey classification systems are now described as both as having satisfactory reliability.
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