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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editor,

The manuscript MS: 205694866110241, entitled "Open reduction and closed reduction internal fixation in treatment of femoral neck fractures: a meta-analysis" has been revised. The authors appreciate the reviewer and editor for the valuable comments and suggestions for our manuscript. The point-by-point responses to the concerns are listed below. We would like to re-submit this revised manuscript to “BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders” and hope it is now acceptable for publication in the journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any concerns.

Yours sincerely,

Zhanwang Xu

**Comment 1. There are still linguistic mistakes (two reductions),**

**Response:** thank you very much. We have revised the linguistic mistakes in the manuscript as much as possible. And we have paid special attentions to the typing of the two reductions.

**Comment 2. There is no need to explain the femur "the long bone running through the thigh". Everybody reads this article must know what is femur.**

**Response:** thanks for your kind suggestion. The description “the long bone running through the thigh” has been deleted.

**Comment 3. How do you know ORIF has decreased pain level. You mentioned**
ORIF has incomplete healing of bone in introduction but you did not find any difference at the end of the article.

Response: thank you for your kind suggestion. We have to apologize for inaccurate quote of the reference[7] that incomplete healing of bone is the potential complication of ORIF, but in our study, we did not find any difference because our meta-analysis summarized the results of nine studies [11-19] which have different conclusions in this issue. Thus, we revised this sentence in introduction as follows: ”Although ORIF has advantages of direct look and restoration of normal function, its application still limited by the potential negative effects of nerve damage, swelling, incomplete healing of the bone, increased pressure and blood clot [7]”. As mentioned above, the inaccurate description “decreased pain” has been deleted.

Comment 4. How do you make a precise comment "So the ORIF is recommended to be optimal treatment for femoral neck fractures" at this controversial issue.

Response: thank you very much. We have to admit that it is too arbitrary to draw the conclusion "So the ORIF is recommended to be optimal treatment for femoral neck fractures" which is based on the inference in the 4th paragraph of the discussion, but might be not precise. So we have revised it to “ORIF offers advantage over CRIF in terms of AVN for treatment of the femoral neck fractures.”