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Author’s response to reviews:

Subject: Amendments for Revision and Respond to Reviewers

Hello dear editor,

I hope you would be fine. Thank you for your REVISION INQUIRY. Followings are the detailed amendments made according to the peer reviewer’s inquiry.

Page (P) 1, Line (L) 1: The word “lag screws” is added in the title.

P1, L3: New authors; Lv Gang, Zhao Zhi, Wang Yanfeng are added in the authors list.
Reason: They have participated in the final review of the manuscript.

P2, L26: Corresponding author’s detailed is changed as followings;

3*Zhang Zhen. Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Dalian Medical University, 222 Zhongshan road, 116011 Dalian, Liaoning, P.R. China. zhangzhendmu@163.com, doctorzz@126.com

2*Lv Decheng. Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, The First Affiliated Hospital of Dalian Medical University, 222 Zhongshan road, 116011 Dalian, Liaoning 116011, P.R. China. lvdecheng_dmu@163.com, lvdecheng55@126.com

Reason: To support the article processing charges, two corresponding authors are added and the sequence is given as above.

Note: If it is mandatory, the change of authorship form can be provided by the corresponding authors.

P4, L61: Background section; the references (1-5) are not changed.

Reason: We have search for related articles and we believe that these references are still ok. One editor has mentioned up-to-dated references. e.g; new classification article etc. We have used this article [reference 15] in our manuscript. And we think that if we arrange its [ref#15] position and use it [ref# 15] along with references (1-5), the whole reference list will be disorganized. So we didn’t make this change. Furthermore it was NOT labeled as essential revision.

P6, L108: Fig 1(b) is changed. The modified figure is clear with white background.

P4, L82- 83: The reason of why we have used the >25% fracture size is explained.

P8, L164: The correct value is “0.60” mm.

P9, L173-175: In Discussion section; the first paragraph begins with a summary of the study results.

P9, L179, L181 & P11, L220, L228: References of the previous biomechanical and clinical studies are addressed and given.
P9, L184-P11, L214: The detailed results of the study are explained.

P11, L216-L231: Detailed comparison of study results with the previous biomechanical and clinical studies is given.

In general, the entire manuscript is revised to address and correct the grammar mistakes. If still left small mistakes, we appreciate editorial office make automatic corrections.

Thanking you and all the reviewers in anticipation.

Kind regards,

Corresponding Authors on behalf of our research team.