Author's response to reviews

Title: Surgical treatment of zygomatic bone fracture using two points fixation versus three point fixation - A randomised prospective clinical trial -

Authors:

Majeed Rana (rana.majeed@mh-hannover.de)
Riaz Warraich (drriazwarraich@hotmail.com)
Salman Tahir (doctorsalvantahir@gmail.com)
Asifa Iqbal (dr_asifa@ymail.com)
Constantin Von See (constantinvonsee@gmx.de)
André M. Eckardt (eckardt.andre@mh-hannover.de)
Nils-Claudius Gellrich (gellrich.nils-claudius@mh-hannover.de)

Version: 3 Date: 5 February 2012

Author's response to reviews: see over
First of all, we would like to thank the editor and all reviewers for their helpful comments which further developed and improved our manuscript entitled “Surgical treatment of zygomatic bone fracture using two points fixation versus three point fixation- A randomised prospective clinical trial -” which is submitted to be considered for publication as an original contribution in Journal of Trials. Neither the entire paper nor any part of it has been published previously or is under consideration for publication elsewhere.

The concerns of the reviewers were changed in the manuscript. Corrections were marked by lining in the text (yellow).

In accordance with the instructions for authors, the manuscript has been approved by all authors and all of them have taken due care to ensure the integrity of their work. We assure that none of the authors disclose any association that poses a conflict of interest.
Surgical treatment of zygomatic bone fracture using two points fixation versus three point fixation
- A randomised prospective clinical trial -

Study by Rana et al.

First of all, we would like to thank the editor for his helpful comments which further developed and improved the manuscript. We have addressed all questions as indicated below.

?I still have concerns re the quality of the reporting. Not only do minor grammatical errors remain but features of CONSORT have not been included, which I highly recommend, and in the results section not only does it not mention the word random but figure 2 contains all results not only baseline characteristics.? 

Respond to the editor:

Reply: We thank the editor for his helpful comment according to the consort. We agree totally with the editor and apologise for this mistake. As the editor can notice, the concert flow diagram is added as figure 1. Detailed explanation of the concert is added in material and methods.

Dear editor, we have responded all points raised by the editor as recommended. The grammatical errors has been checked and corrected and a flow chart has been added.

Thank you and your editorial board for your efforts.

Sincerely yours,

Majeed Rana,, M.D; D.D.S

2012-02-02