Dear Editor,
We thank the reviewers and editorial team for taking their time and efforts to comment our article to analyze its value for publication and provide constructive comments to further improve the quality of the manuscript. Herewith we submit the revised version of the article revised based on the comments obtained from the reviewers for your consideration for publication.

Reviewer Comments
This study, presented as an editorial, briefly introduced using different types of plates for the treatment of lateral clavicle fracture. The study is written well and I have only one comment.

Regarding the section of “Comparative Studies”, if possible, I would suggest the authors add outcomes of recent RCTs comparing these plates for the management of distal clavicle fractures.

Authors Reply
We thank the reviewer for his keen observation and positive comments appreciating the work submitted. We have now included the recent RCTs comparing the plates in the management of distal clavicle fractures.

We once again thank the reviewer for taking his time and effort to comment on our work.
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“Recently published biomechanical studies showcase the superiority of lateral locking plates with orthogonal antero-posterior locking screw placement in the lateral fragment to negate the need for CC stabilization.\textsuperscript{[1]} Further, clinical trial results demonstrated comparable clinical outcomes at one year in hook plate and locking plate constructs.\textsuperscript{[2]} However, quicker recovery is noted in the locking plate fixation.\textsuperscript{[3]} Similar results were noted between the locking and non-locking plate constructs.\textsuperscript{[4]}”
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