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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting paper on a rare condition. Generally it is well written, but few changes are needed.

First of all they did not number the lines which makes the reviewing process harder.

Please do not write in first person, never use “our study” “we..”.

Introduction

I like this section because is succinct and goes straight to the point.

First sentence needs a reference, further are there any data in the literature suggesting an incidence of this complication?

Last sentence of the the introduction is a limitation and should not be here, remove it and put in the discussion

patients and methods

I would make a heading like MATERIAL AND METHODS

and then subheading like patients surgical technique and post-operative protocol

page 4, line 4, when the authors say nonunion of the radius evolved in 7, … they need to add here “patients”

page 4, line 9, when you describe the patients ...all the patients had a segment bone defect, and the patients had....remove “the patients had”

surgical technique

is not a correct subheading since in this section you describe the post-operative care as well (see above)

page 5, the first sentence needs a reference

for the post-operative care please better describe the antibiotics protocol... all the patients did the same? And the cultures?

Results

among the complication where were the pins reapplied in the 5 patients?

In the 4 patients with delayed union and the 2 with poor regenerated bone formation how big was the bone defect after the debridment? For these 6 and for
the 3 with recurrent drainage, how long was the follow-up after second treatment?

Discussion

please start with the main finding of the current study

second sentence needs a reference, however this was already stated in the introduction

at the end of page 8 when you say that cancellous bone graft it is not enough to fill massive defect you need a reference, and which is the limit?

When you mention the Ilizarov method, please explain in what it was superior

Page 9, second paragraph, In the present study...bone transport To avoid.. remove the capital letter.

Further in this paragraph, given that I totally agree with you, use the sentence “In the author opinion” or use references

Page 9, last paragraph : It is a critical problem... this sentence is not to clear

page 10, when you speak about neurovascular injuries, this data need to be in the results

page 10 at the end of the page, the sentence: Besides, previous intervention.... is not to clear

page 10 when you speak about the advantages of a monolateral external fixation, here would be interesting to compare your data with the ilizarov study, and discuss the differences

Which one were your limitations? (one is in the last sentence of the introduction)

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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