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Reviewer's report:
Authors resolved some of my concerns and comments. However, the following comments still need to be resolved to improve the manuscript.
For my previous comment 2, “It is not described clearly how the two comparison groups of “the integrity of lesser trochanter existed before surgery” and “the integrity of lesser trochanter disappeared before surgery” were appropriate to evaluate the purpose of the study. At least based on the current version of introduction, according to “most surgeons will not fix the lesser trochanter using intramedullary nail to treat intertrochanteric fractures in clinical practice”, it is difficult for readers to understand the relationship. Authors need to provide more relevant background introduction and references for making the linking to be more scientifically fluent.” I do not mean how the integrity of the lesser trochanter was assessed. I understand that there may not be previous references, but could authors please provide more linking knowledge for the request above? this would help clarify this and let readers more easily to follow the manuscript.
Answer:We have clearly expressed the question both in background (line 28-30) and in introduction(line 72-73) of this paper, whether the integrity of the lesser trochanter affects the surgical outcome is the question of our study and we ask 10 skeletal trauma doctors in our country, they could easily understand this issue and follow the manuscript.
For comment 3, in such case authors may want to only mention that 85 patients were eligible and were studied in this study, but not mention 127 without providing the flow for the selection process.

Answer: Yes, we have expressed it clearly again in the following: “Eighty-five of 127 patients were eligible for this study, but 42 patients were lost to follow-up at 1-year postoperatively”, you could see it in line 86-87. The flow was not needed in such small study, which has clearly inclusion and excluded criteria.