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Reviewer's report:

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

Minor Essential Revisions:
Before submitting the manuscript, the authors need to check the manuscript carefully to avoid the following mistakes:
1. Abstract, background: the period is missed for the last sentence.
2. Background, first paragraph: “Even tough unsatisfactory…” should be changed into “Even though unsatisfactory…”.
3. Patients and Methods, second paragraph: the right parentheses is missing for the sentence “…fracture type (3- or 4-part proximal…”.
4. Surgical technique, second paragraph: “…is made of stainless steal…” should be changed into “…is made of stainless steel…”
5. Surgical technique, second paragraph: “…up to 2,5 mm.” should be changed into “…up to 2.5 mm.” Similar mistakes should be corrected in the next paragraph (i.e., 2.5 mm, 2.7 mm, 3.0 mm).
6. Surgical technique, third paragraph: “…the 2 2.5 mm k-wires…” should be changed into “…the two 2.5 mm k-wires…”. Similar mistakes should be corrected in the rest of the manuscript.
7. Surgical technique, third paragraph: “…cut a few millimetres away of…” should be changed into “…cut a few millimetres away from…”.
8. Data collection/Clinical and radiological evaluation, first paragraph: comma should be added after “The Constant Murley score (CMS) [11]” and “the UCLA score [12]”.
9. Statistical analysis: “Data consistency were checked…” should be changed into “Data consistency was checked…”.
10. Statistical analysis: “…and were done by one of the authors (WH)” should be deleted.

11. Discussion, second paragraph: “…in older patients it may is more important to…” should be changed into “…in older patients it may be more important to…”.

12. Discussion, fourth paragraph: the period should be added after “…to promote AVN development [19, 20]”.

13. Discussion, fourth paragraph: “On general” should be changed into “In general”.

14. Discussion, fourth paragraph: “…the humerusblock allows…” should be changed into “…the Humerusblock allows…”.
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