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Reviewer 1:

Reviewer: In the discussion the drop out rate of > 30% should be stated as a Limitation.
Answer: We made revisions and stated the drop-out rate in the Discussion and Limitation sections.

Reviewer: Since the Distribution of the type of accident is not equal in both Groups, the median value of both Groups should be stated to have a better distinguish to two Groups and to get at least an idea of the predominated Age Group treated by each method.
Answer: We added the overall demographics to table 1. Please find the requested information in table 1.

Minor essential revisions:

We worked on all minor essential revisions and changed everything according to the reviewers’ instructions.

Language correction was done by American Journal Experts: https://www.aje.com/en.

Reviewer 2.

Reviewer: The authors do not cite any reference that has the comparison study concerning the postoperative outcome between angular stable plates and Humerusblock. Is there any previous published work that compared the treatment with those two methods?
Answer: This is the first comparative study comparing the Humerusblock to another implant. Only one retrospective study comparing the Humerusblock with Reverse Shoulder Arthroplasty in treatment of proximal humeral fractures exists.

Reviewer: It will be helpful to show the information of a matched pair example. It is not clear whether all the conditions are the same including gender, handedness, affected side and fracture type, except an age difference with in 3 years?
Answer: Please see the new table 2 with all of the information from the matched-pair example.

Reviewer: A brief introduction of the CMS, UCLA, and SST scores would be beneficial to the reader who do not have those backgrounds.
Answer: Please see an introduction of the CMS, UCLA, and SST scores in the Data Collection/Clinical and Radiological Evaluation section.

Reviewer: Please add some labels related to the surgical technique description since it is hard to understand the without a clear figure.
Answer: Please see Figures 1, 4 and 5. Figure 1 shows the limitation of the HB, Figure 4 shows surgical instruments and implants and figure 5 shows an example of reduction.

Minor essential revisions:

We worked on all the minor essential revisions and changed everything according to the reviewers’ instructions.
Reviewer 3

Reviewer: Based on the results of this work, it seems that the Humerusblock in the treatment of complex 3- and 4-part fractures is definitely better to the angular stable plating. However, why the angular stable plating is still being used by the clinician? Are there any limitations for the Humerusblock? The authors need to provide a comprehensive introduction of both treatments.

Answer: Please see the limitations of HB in the Patients and Methods section. We also added examples of the limitations to Figure 1. HB and PHILOS are used in our institution. Some surgeons prefer Humerusblock and some the PHILOS plate.

Reviewer: The description regarding Figs. 1 and 2 is too little. Actually, these two figures could help authors to demonstrate the superiority of the Humerusblock

Answer: We added table 2, which includes additional information on the matched pair.

Minor essential revisions:

We worked on all minor essential revisions and changed everything according to the reviewers’ instructions.

Language correction was done by American Journal Experts: https://www.aje.com/en.