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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No
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Comments to authors:

This article presents a case study of concomitant subcapital and intertrochanteric fractures sustained in a 36 year old male motorcyclist. The surgical fixation used to treat this particular type of fracture presentation may however not be sufficiently unique to warrant publication in the orthopaedic literature.

Page 1. Abstract

The abstract does not convey any argument regarding why this particular case study would be of significant interest to the orthopaedic community.

Page 3. Introduction

Four previous cases of ipsilateral neck and intertrochanteric fractures are quoted from literature published between 1989 and 1999. The authors do not specify the
year limit for the literature review and whether or not the past ten years were included.

Page 3. Case presentation
The first paragraph informs the reader that the segmental fracture of the femoral neck was sustained when the motorcyclist was hit by a car. It would have been more informative to explain in greater detail the exact mechanism of injury, including the direction of impact to the hip joint and speed of the vehicles involved. The authors could have expanded upon the post operative rehabilitation and progression from touch weight bearing status, to provide a complete overview of the post operative management. The reader is also informed that the patient is asymptomatic at the two year follow up, but this is not quantified with any explanation of post operative function which the patient achieved.

Page 5. Discussion
In the discussion a hypothesis is put forward to explain why this unusual fracture pattern occurred. Earlier detail regarding the exact mechanism of the patient’s injury would have put into context the reasons why the concomitant fractures may have occurred.

Page 6. Conclusion(First sentence)
This paper does not necessarily provide sufficient evidence to conclude that segmental fractures of the femoral neck are extremely rare. It is possible that the low incidence may simply reflect the negligible reports of this injury within the literature, as no evidence is quoted from the past decade.

The sentences and English language used in this paper are occasionally staccato in nature and some amendments would therefore be necessary to improve the readability of the paper.

This paper is succinct, but greater detail may allow the reader to attain a more comprehensive clinical picture. The key point which the paper coveys is that segmental fractures of the femoral neck are rare. The paper also demonstrates that the selected fixation method was successful in one particular patient. These messages would not change or inform clinical practice which means that they may not generate sufficient orthopaedic interest to warrant publication.

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