Answering reviewers

Dear Editor,

We truly appreciate your kind letter and the opportunity to revise and modify once more our paper to '*World Journal of Orthopedics*'. The reviewers gave us very insightful and helpful suggestions.

We have included the reviewers' comments immediately after this letter and responded to them individually, indicating exactly how we addressed each concern or problem and describing the changes we made, mentioning the lines of the manuscript. We marked the manuscript's modified part with red color (case presentation part which we re-wrote). Also, regarding minor changes of reference styles and brackets, we did not mark all of them but thoroughly reviewed them. Reference number 4 is a book and number 6 did not have a DOI. Furthermore, we reviewed through the title page and modified it according to the journal's guidelines. ***As there was no specific section for re-written title page in revision file upload page, we attached it as a 'supplemetary material'.*** We added Yong Chan Lee to the list of authors, as he did critical and important role in this revision. The revisions were approved by all authors. In revision page, we could not upload more than one conflict-of-interest file, leaving no choice but to upload that of the corresponding author's.

Authors are sincerely grateful for what the reviewers pointed out. The editor has gratefully helped us to write a better article by keeping us aware of things we may have not noticed otherwise.

We hope this manuscript will better suit the '*World Journal of Orthopedics*', but are sincerely happy to consider further revisions, and we appreciate your continued interest in our research.

Thank you for your interest in our study and for your thorough review.

Sincerely yours,

Authors

Peer review report

Reviewer #1:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: The author presented a case of osteochondroma after avulsion fracture of anterior inferior iliac spine. This case report is well written and interesting.

➔ Thank you for your words.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
Specific Comments to Authors: The case report is very interesting and very well reported. My opinion is that it can be accepted as it is.

➔ Thank you for your remark.

Editorial Office's comments

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the posttraumatic osteochondroma after AIIS avulsion fracture. The topic is within the scope of the WJO.

(1) Classification: Grade A and Grade B

(2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors presented a case of osteochondroma after avulsion fracture of anterior inferior iliac spine. This case report is well written and interesting.

The authors need to discuss the association between osteochondroma and rectus femoris tendon insertion. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered

➔ Thank you for your comment. We mentioned the association in lines 87-88 of the manuscript.

(3) Format: There are 9 figures. A total of 8 references are cited, including 2 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade A. A language editing certificate issued by Editage was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, written informed consent, and the CARE Checklist form. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJO. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. This manuscript is the resubmission of Manuscript No. 56246 (Withdraw).

➔ Thank you for your effort with the review.

5 Issues raised:

(1) I found no “Author contribution” section. Please provide the author contributions

➔ We apologize for the miss. We added ‘Author contribution’ section in lines 12-15 of the title page.

(2) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor

➔ Thank you for your comment. We added the powerpoint file in the attached file list.

(3) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout

➔ Thank you for your comment. We added PMID and DOI in the reference list and checked the authros of the references.

(4) I found the “Case Presentation” did not meet our requirements. Please re-write the “Case Presentation” section, and add “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” section to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

➔ Thank you for your major advice. We re-wrote the whole ‘Case Presentation’ section in lines 41-99. ‘Final diagnosis’, ‘Treatment’, and ‘Outcome and follow-up’ were already written in the ‘Case Presentation’ section, but we read through it again while re-writing the whole section.

6 Re-Review: Required.

7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

➔ Thank you for your effort.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

➔ Thank you for your effort.