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

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

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?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

First of all they along the manuscript they mention a case of an intertrocantheric fracture and only at page 4 they classified this femoral fracture which is a reverse oblique multifragmentary fracture (33.A3.3) please remark this kind of fracture.

The Author did not suspect which this non union should be a mistake of the primary surgery as known in the literature (George J. Haidukewych, T. Andrew Israel and Daniel J. BerryJ Bone Joint Surg Am. 2001;83:643-650.)

Furthermore the ruptured nail did not find any explication?

How the Author explain with the revision surgery changing the kind of
osteosynthesis which the final good result is done by the combination of RIA autograft, BMP-7 and HA cement and not by a better biomechanically device?

How was the cost for this revision surgery and it was justified by the authors?

Finally they are sure which this is the best approach to heal this kind of complications?

The figures need to be cut in a better way.
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