

Dear Sir

I have read with interest the comments of the reviewers on this article and I have made changes in the manuscript according to these valuable comments. The changes were written in red line.

Thank you very much

Barakat El-Alfy

Reviewer 2

1- Abstract: The follow-up duration, primary and secondary outcomes should be clearly mentioned. A success rate of 86% was mentioned in the main text. If this was the primary outcome of the study, it should be mentioned in the abstract. The functional outcomes of the patients should be stated. Complications of the procedures can be mentioned.

The abstract was adjusted according to these instructions. These parameters were included in the abstract

2- Methodology: Please state if clinical research ethics approval has been obtained for this study.

This clinical research was approved by the ethical committee, P4, and the IRB approval was up loaded

Please state the distribution of gender of the patients.

The gender distribution was included. P4

Please clarify when was the soft tissue removed from the docking site and was the skin fashioned to cover the bone ends.

The soft tissue was removed and the soft tissue was fashioned at the time of docking which varies from one patient to another. It depends mainly on the size of the defect. Usually each 1 cm of the defect takes 10 days of distraction. So, patient with a defect of 5 cm will take 50 days to reach the docking site.

The protoacol for limb lengthening should be mentioned.

This was mentioned in the text. P 4, 5

The follow-up duration, assessment protocol as well as primary and secondary outcomes should be mentioned in the methodology section instead of the result section.

This was mentioned in the methodology section. P 5

Whether the same surgeon(s) was/were involved in the surgery and assessment of results as well as years of experience of surgeon(s) should be stated.

All cases were done by the same surgeon (The author of this article) and he has a good experience in the field of limb lengthening and reconstruction (about 20 years with many publications in this field).

A comment about the importance of experience was added in the conclusion section, P8

The assessment based on ASAMI should be mentioned in the methodology section. The rehabilitation protocol should be mentioned

All of these parameters were mentioned in the methodology chapter. P 5

The rehabilitation program was mentioned in P 4

Discussion: Please clarify how the successful rate of 86% was calculated.

This percentage represents the cases with satisfactory results according to the ASAMI scoring system. The functional results were satisfactory in 25 out of 28 cases and the bone results were satisfactory in 26 out of 28 cases.

The total number of cases with unsatisfactory results were 4 cases. One with unsatisfactory bone results only, two with unsatisfactory functional results only and one with unsatisfactory both bone and functional results. To avoid this confusion I will remove this percentage P 7

p.7, fifth last line, it should be “distraction osteogenesis”.

It was corrected

References: Most of the references are quite outdated. More updated references should be included.

Some recent references were added, P 11, 12.

Figure and figure legends: fine

General: There are some minor grammatical mistakes. Please check the manuscript again.

It was checked