Reviewer 1

1. We agree. We have added two more search engines to our study (Scopus and Web Of Science-WoS), from which we have extracted 38 results. Of these 38 papers, only 17 were new unique entries, while 21 were duplicates. We added these data in the Materials and Methods and Results sections and in figure 1.
2. We have shortened the part of the Background section, regarding the pathology, as suggested. We have deleted two sentences about the osteotomy healing and the medical treatment. We have also shortened the remaining part, removing the term “best device” to define the intramedullary nailing.
3. We have included Boolean Search methods in the Materials and Methods section, as requested.
4. We have verified all the references of the 14 elegibles studies adding only one more study to our review. We reported this data in figure 1.
5. We have added in the Results section additional information on the reasons of excluding papers in each stage. We have also added the same data in Figure 1 as requested.
6. We have clarified the specific treatment recommendations for coxa vara, Sheperd’s Crook and complex deformities at the end of Discussion section.
7. We have added the intraoperative, postoperative and late complications reported in all the included studies in Table 2. We excluded all the recurrences of the deformities often reported by the authors.
8. We have shortened the Conclusions section, as requested. We have deleted the sentence reporting that the best fixation method is intramedullary nail and the same sentences regarding the surgical technique.

Reviewer 2

1. We have written an invited manuscript choosing a non-systematic review of PFD/MAS. We believe that for this rare pathological condition, it is very hard to strictly follow all the criteria necessary for a systematic review.
2. We agree. We have added in the title MAS, as suggested. We have also added the reference about PICOT.
3. We agree. We have modified our literature search about the topic by querying not only the Medline database, but also Scopus and Web of Science (WOS).
4. We did not find any study eligible for our review published after 2018.
5. We agree. We have deleted the terms “best device” to define the intramedullary nail, modifying, in accordance also with the other reviewer, our Introduction, Discussion and Conclusions sections.
6. We agree. We have modified Table 1, as suggested. We have also added in the Results section the specific reasons for exclusion of the evaluated studies.
7. We have added in the last paragraph of the Discussion that all papers are retrospective studies without control groups. We have also added the requested reference (n. 3).
8. We have added the missing reference (n. 4), as requested.
9. We have added the missing reference (n. 17), as requested.
10. We have added, at the end of the Discussion a paragraph reporting strengths and limitations of our review.