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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

AUTHOR’S RESPONSE - Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and providing us with your valuable suggestions.

Abstract Line no 52 typo

AUTHOR’S RESPONSE – As advised by the reviewer, correction made.

Line no 53 No need to reference tables in abstract

AUTHOR’S RESPONSE – As advised by the reviewer, correction made.

Line no 54, Kindly rephrase

AUTHOR’S RESPONSE – Done

Line No 75 rephrase

AUTHOR’S RESPONSE – Done

Line No 297,298 Did u have any rationale behind the allocation of patients to the group concerned becoz if the allocation was random then the effects of the study could be accepted, since its a retrospective evaluation dont u think the reason for this allocation might be based on a rationale that resulted in the equality of the outcomes observed. If so kindly mention .

AUTHOR’S RESPONSE – As mentioned in the limitations, there was no rationale for
the type of fixation.

Reviewer’s code:

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Thank you once again for the review and your thoughtful comments and suggestions.