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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Guenther,

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript again, and thanks for your constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “Locking Compression Plate distal ulna hook plate fixation Versus Intramedullary Screw fixation for displaced avulsion Fifth Metatarsal Base Fractures: a comparative retrospective cohort study” (BMSD-D-17-00704R1).

We have studied your comments carefully and have made revision according to your comments. All the amendments and updated references were made in the clean revised manuscript. Additionally, the point-to-point responses were enclosed to this file and were noted in Blue.

We have made every effort to revise the manuscript, and we hope that the revision will meet with approval.

Once again, we greatly appreciate your/reviewers’ earnest work.

With best regards.

Yours sincerely,
Figure 4: The figure shows 3D reformations of CT scans in addition to the plain radiographs. Please mention the CT scan in the figure's caption.

Figure 3/4: If possible, it would be great if the authors could provide lateral projections of the foot as well (three view series).

Table 1/2: Please explain abbreviations in the tables' caption.

Reply to Comment:

We are very grateful for your kindness in sparing your valuable time for reviewing our manuscript submission. We quite agree with your constructive suggestions which will make the quality of the manuscript greatly improved. Because of the limitation of the lateral projections of the foot, we followed the routine of the AP & Oblique and had no the lateral projections of the foot. The figure and table’s captions have been improved (line 227 page 6).

Thank you

Material and Methods: Did the authors obtain ethical approval and informed consent from every single patient?

Results: "All the patients were required with the short-leg cast for 3 weeks. Radiographs were taken only on initial presentation to the clinic and in those patients with a great deal of pain clinically at the fracture site at the 6-week stage. Fracture union was defined radiographically by bridging bone on at least 3 of 4 cortices." This section should be part of the Material and Methods section. Please do not state methods in the Results section.

Discussion: Please start the discussion with a sentence like "The main finding of this study is..."

Conclusion: The conclusion should be based on the results of the study. Please delete "We believe this construct improves fracture stability, provide earlier recovery and return to work".

Reply to Comment:
We are very grateful for your kindness in sparing your valuable time for reviewing our manuscript submission. We quite agree with your constructive suggestions which will make the quality of the manuscript greatly improved. In our study, ethical approval and informed consent from every single patient was obtained (line 72 page 3). "All the patients were required with the short-leg cast for 3 weeks. Radiographs were taken only on initial presentation to the clinic and in those patients with a great deal of pain clinically at the fracture site at the 6-week stage. Fracture union was defined radio graphically by bridging bone on at least 3 of 4 cortices." This section has been transferred to the Material and Methods section. The discussion and the conclusion have been improved.

Thank you