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Reviewer’s report:

Minor
-the discussion section is quite long and it should be shortened by about 20%, perhaps only using best systematic reviews available, currently the discussion section is about half of the paper
-the discussion section should discuss the strength and weakness of this retrospective study
-in abstract the word dislocated should be replaced by displaced.
-the experience of the surgeons should be described as this is a technically demanding procedure
-the associated soft tissue damage with the fracture should be described as it can be prognostic
-the authors should clarify whether surgeons or radiologists declared fracture healing
-how was patient compliance monitored with regards to pin site management? Please describe
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