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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Lacheta,

Your manuscript "Proximal Radius Fracture Morphology Following Axial Force Impact: A Biomechanical Evaluation of Fracture Patterns" (BMSD-D-18-00156R1) has been assessed by our reviewers. Based on these reports, and my own assessment as Editor, I am pleased to inform you that it is potentially acceptable for publication in BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders, once you have carried out some essential revisions suggested by our reviewers.

Author’s response: Dear editor, we appreciate your time and effort to improve our manuscript and considering the manuscript for publication in the journal of BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.

Answer to the reviewer:

Sepp Braun (Reviewer 1):

The presented manuscript biomechanically evaluates fracture patterns of radial head fractures to confirm clinical observations and determine the impact force leading to thus fractures.
The manuscript is well written and of clinical interest for the broad readership. The methods are well planned and the results also appear to be comprehensive. The discussion is appropriate.

Author’s response: Thank you for kind words.

At least I can not understand the statement in the conclusions, that the results of the study should be considered in preoperative planning. The authors should explain why - as preoperative planning depends on diagnostic imaging of the patient that should be operated on.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment. We totally agree and removed this statement in the conclusion section (Line 59+188).

Tobias M Kraus (Reviewer 2): Abstract

Well written and precise summary of the topic.

The topic is of clinical relevance and the article is of scientific merit.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment.

Introduction

Well written and leads directly to the topic.

No remarks or changes needed.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment.

Materials & Methods

The number of specimen seems to be sufficient.

The testing methods are valid.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment.

Discussion

Well written. All relevant references are mentioned.
Conclusion

This section summarizes very well the presented work. The conclusion and the hypothesis are answered correctly.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment.

References

The presented references respect the lastest findings.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment.

Specimen: the provided pictures of the biomechanical setting very well illustrate the topic and the scientific value.

Author’s response: Thank you for your comment.