

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Rejection

Specific Comments to Authors: No sufficient evidence

Response to Reviewer #1: Thank you for your time considering our paper

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The present study included a retrospective review of patients with NMS underwent PSF with fixation that incorporated the pelvis to determine whether PSF with pelvic fixation using iliac or SAI screws in ambulatory NMS patients affects postoperative ambulatory ability. A total of 118 patients were enrolled into the study, including 11 ambulatory patients, and found that it is safe for ambulatory patients with NMS to undergo PSF incorporating the pelvis using modern constructs and spinal fusion to the pelvis in ambulatory patients with NMS provides effective deformity correction without compromising ambulatory capabilities. This study is the second evaluation of this treatment method and the results have some significance. In term of this, the manuscript is acceptable, However, several minor revisions are needed. 1. the number of patients with different diagnosis is 119, why not 118? 2. The first appearance of MCM and PO in Line 75 should be fully defined. 3. The results part is not clearly displayed especially when comparing the total change of MCM and PO between the ambulatory and non-ambulatory groups in Line 83 and complication part in Line 88. TABLE is better.

Response to Reviewer #2: Thank you for your feedback and consideration. To answer your first question, we had one patient that had overlapping diagnoses, which is why the discrepancy appears in the numbers. To respond to your second comment, the necessary edits have been made to ensure that all abbreviations are fully defined before any such abbreviations are used. In response to your third comment, we have now created Table #2 to better organize the findings.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority Publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General Priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript is original with a long retrospective period. However, can you please define how primary and secondary outcomes were identified.

Response to Reviewer #3: Thank you for your consideration and support in accepting our paper for publication. To respond to your question, the primary and secondary outcomes are defined in the Materials and Methods section on page 6/18. The primary outcome was defined based upon our null hypothesis and was the core question we wanted to answer in the paper. The secondary outcomes were those related to surgical outcomes including correction of deformity and complication profile to see if any of those variables were affected by or had an effect on the patient's ability to ambulate.