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Reviewer’s report:

A well written comparative study on a complex problem.

The limitations are well outlined. I think a major limitation is the lack of "patient reported outcomes" that looks at function between the groups, specifically the patients who were found to have glenohumeral lesions at the time of hardware removal. It would add to this manuscript if we know the symptoms abated after hardware removal. If not, the case for identifying and treating such associated glenohumeral lesions at the outset becomes much more relevant and strong.

On a more general note, majority of distal clavicle fractures are still treated by general orthopedic surgeons, especially in the developing world. Do the authors think that such fractures should be referred to surgeons with expertise of carrying out arthroscopic procedures around the shoulder?

A comment on shoulder function (especially abduction) between the groups, and between those with and without GH lesions, would be very informative.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
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