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Reviewer's report:

The paper describes an interesting single arm prospective study aimed at examining the safety of in-screw augmented sacroiliac screw fixation for fragility fractures of the pelvis. The author collected data on quality of life, pain scores mobility and implant failure. There are a number of issues that I would suggest the authors to address:

1. One major issue is the lack of clear comparators which makes it difficult to judge the value of the procedure. Comparators are necessary and need to be clearly stated in the Methods section to guide statistical analyses of the endpoints: pain scores (currently before v after), quality of life (currently against national average), mobility (not declared) and implant failure (not declared).

2. There is one in-hospital death - please explain whether this is related to the procedure

3. The cohort is over-whelmingly female - how would this skew the results (quality of life for instance, the comparator is age matched group but is it gender matched?)

4. The procedure results in 2 re-intervention out of 34 patients - how does this compare to the chosen comparator and what does this say about the complexity of the procedure and impact on patients’ quality of life

5. Figure 4 showed that after 12 months the pain scores are significantly diffused compared to at discharge. Please discuss implications and possible reasons.

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.

No
Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?  
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

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 am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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