

Dear editors and reviewers

Thanks for reaching out to us regarding the manuscript entitled " Odontoid Fracture Complicating Ankylosing Spondylitis Presenting with Cervical Canal Stenosis and Quadriplegia: A Case Report with 5-year Follow-up and Review of the Literature". We believe that these comments have helped us enhance the quality of the manuscript. We also have done our best to revise as well as improve the paper according to the comments. Herewith, we provided the authors' response to each comment right after each statement. Also, all the changes have been highlighted in the manuscript. Please feel free to contact us if you need further information.

Best regards,

Corresponding author

Reviewer #1:

Thanks for recommending me as a reviewer. In this mini review paper, authors reviewed the literature to find the current post-operative care and rehabilitation programs during and after limb lengthening and reconstruction. The research is overall well written. If authors complete minor revisions, the quality of the study will be further improved.

Thank you for your time and effort in evaluation the manuscript. I hope the answers are clear to your valuable comments on the article. Your opinion can improve the quality of the manuscript and decrease misunderstanding.

1. The introduction section is well written. However, a paragraph cannot consist of a single sentence. I suggest that the authors combine the last paragraph of the introduction section with the previous one.

Duly noted. Thank you for pointing out this shortcoming. We combined the last paragraph to the previous one.

2. Conclusion section is too short. If the authors made the conclusion section more specific, it would be helpful for readers to understand.

Thank you for this valuable note. We revised it.

Reviewer #2:

Thank you very much for the presentation of your research, it is a great job you have done, but I suggest the following indications:

Thank you for your time and effort in evaluation the manuscript.

- In the section of introduction and development of the different techniques to treat HF you should introduce dates (year) to the different approaches that have been given throughout history. Although you cite the reference, it is better to include the year, so that the reader does not have to see it in the reference section.

Thank you for this valuable note. We revised the introduction part in order to include the year of each development.

- They allude to physiotherapy treatment techniques, today there is a consensus and scientific evidence that one of the best treatments is dry needling on the trigger point of the spasmed muscle, please make reference to this technique and its advantages.

Thank you for pointing out this matter. We added the related reference and mentioned the requested advantages.

- In the statement "the role of continuous passive movement is still unknown", there are numerous articles that provide a benefit and evidence to passive mobility in different segments, please review and provide references in this regard.

Thank you for noticing this point. We revised the manuscript and provided the related references and statements.

- In the subluxation/dislocation section you should refer to the rule that if there is a body segment with a hypomobility (deficit of movement), the nearest segment (joint) will assume that deficit creating a hypermobility (increased movement, and therefore the possibility of subluxation) thus creating a compensatory mechanism automatically and involuntarily by the patient.

Duly noted. Thank you for pointing out this shortcoming. We mentioned this important role as requested.

Otherwise, I congratulate you on your writing and for having done such a good job. Best regards

Thank you. I hope the answers are clear to your valuable comments on the article. Your opinion can improve the quality of the manuscript and decrease misunderstanding.