Reviewer’s report

Title: Acromioclavicular joint dislocation treated with Bosworth Screw and additional K-wire fixation: Results after in mean 7.8 years - Still an adequate procedure?

Version: 0 Date: 28 Jan 2017

Reviewer: Amanda Esquivel

Reviewer's report:

This study described the long-term follow up of the treatment of acromioclavicular joint dislocation using the Bosworth screw with additional K-wiring. The aim of the study was to present 'long-term' follow up outcomes after this particular procedure. There is no control group and the authors were not comparing surgical techniques. Twenty-two patients were included in the study with a mean follow up time of 91 months. The minimum follow up time was 12 months. For a long term follow up study, the authors should consider eliminating patients with a follow up time of less than 24 months and re-examine their data.

Other comments:

Lines 143-155: Is there any information on the clinical scores (Constant, DASH, ASES, SST, UCLA, VAS) before surgery? Comparing scores before and after surgery would strengthen the manuscript.

Line 161 is not clear - please re-write and clarify your meaning

Lines 160-165 - Did the authors examine the differences between the injured and uninjured sides?

The first paragraph of the discussion (starting with line 185) repeats the results and should not be included.

Line 210 - The authors indicate a major advantage of the technique is that it is inexpensive. However, if patients require a second surgery, how does that add to the cost of the technique?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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