

Please resolve all issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report and make a point-by-point response to each of the issues raised in the peer review report, and **highlighted the revised/added contents with yellow color in the revised manuscript**. Note, authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the peer-review report(s) and provide point-by-point responses to each of the issues raised in the peer-review report(s); these are listed below for your convenience:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The case report is not novel. However, I think it deserves publication if the authors can follow my suggestions.

First, the benefits of nerve hydrodissection can be highlighted more. The following reference is suggested to cite: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32162601/>

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. The content is supplemented and the reference is cited.

Second, the sonoanatomy of the posterior interosseous nerve should be more elaborated. The following reference is suggested to cite: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26135374/>

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. The content is supplemented and the reference is cited.

Third, the regimen used for nerve hydro-dissection is an important issue for its effectiveness. The following reference is suggested to cite: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32197544/>

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. The content is supplemented and the reference is cited.

Fourth, in Figure 3, the authors should label the supinator muscle.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion, the supinator muscle was labeled as “su” in fig.3.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: It is an interesting manuscript. Authors succeed to present their data in a clear way adding information to the existing literature.

Therefore, I have no corrections to do and the manuscript can be published unaltered.

Answer: Thank you!

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This case report well written, but it has some small problems (see below) and is not acceptable for publication in the present form. Minor points

1) Keywords: Ultrasound-guided? “Ultrasound-guided injection” is appropriate.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. We made some modifications from “Ultrasound-guided” to “Ultrasound-guided injection” as you suggested.

Also, we have consulted a lot of literature, “Ultrasound-guided Hydrodissection” is widely used as well.

2) References: See Instructions for authors. revise journal’s name and authors’ name.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. The references are modified.

3) Figures and Table: Please add more explanations (e.g. arrows in Fig.3, detailed legends in Fig. 3 and Table)

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. Explanations are added in the manuscript.

4) Image examination: please add more about probe. Frequency and focus.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. Probe details are added in the manuscript.