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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract - conclusion is confusing. Needs clarification.

Materials & methods –

1. How was the division of the patients done? The authors say that the study was retrospective, but the description in mateirals and methods makes it sound like prospective.

2. It is not clear about the differentiation of the groups. In the abstract the second group is mentioned as one treated with only hook plate. But in the M7 M, the mention the use of locking plates in the second group as well.

3. "In addition, a subacromial arthroscopy was conduced prior to implant removal. Patients of both groups were clinically and radiographically followed for 12 months." - Again confusing statement, different representation of the group 2. Whether the diagnostic arthroscopy was performed at the time of the primary fixation or not? it is not clear.

Discussion - "For the first time, our study shows that glenohumeral pathologies are not only observed during primary arthroscopic fracture treatment, but are also present more than 6 months thereafter" - What is the importance of this finding?

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

No

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.

Unable to assess
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:
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