

## Response letter

Dear Editor,

Thanks for your comments and suggestions on our manuscript. We have carefully revised the manuscript accordingly. Hopefully this revision will make our manuscript acceptable for the publication in your journal. The following is the point by point response to the reviewers' comments.

### Round-1

1. Abstract: first paragraph should in present tense  $\beta$ -Crosslaps should be  $\beta$ -CrossLaps Instead of "The child was relieved after a low-calcium diet. " you may want to say " Phenotypic markers of CMD were reduced after a low calcium diet."

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

2. Introduction: Change sentence to "Excess bone formation in the jaw can delay development of dentition or result in non-erupting teeth. "

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

3. Clinical Investigation: Instead of "facial nerve parlay" do you mean facial nerve paralysis?

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

4. Intervention: Include a sentence with the age of the boy at the beginning of the diet. Are the reference values in Table 1 adjusted for the age of the child?

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

5. Please mention the age range that these reference values are for. Include the age of the child years and months in the table for each step of the treatment like 3, 6, 14 ,33 month of treatment. Reference values change with age, although there may not be sufficient data available. PTH 、 OST 、 Combined $\beta$ -Crosslaps 、 25-hydroxyvitaminD

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

6. Discussion: Last paragraph: What do you mean with "prompt osteogenesis"? Rephrase the sentence "After 3 months and 8 months , alkaline phosphatase was reduced to the same level implying that osteogenesis was still higher". Why would ALP levels that are reduced to normal range indicate high bone formation (osteogenesis)? "...over the bone resorption..." do you want to state that OC levels

that were still above the reference levels indicated that there was still more bone formation despite the reduced ALP levels?

**Response: Thanks for the comments. We have checked the raw data and reviewed the reference values at different age. A revised version with clearer explanation has been included in the text.**

7. Conclusion: Beta-CTX and osteocalcin levels are still high after the diet regimen. Beta-CTX is a measure of osteoclast activity or bone resorption and osteocalcin of osteoblast activity. Both being increased suggests that there is still a higher bone turnover in the patient. This should be considered in the conclusions or discussion. Therefore, these sentences need some re-writing or re-interpretation: “While OC levels also lowered, they remained above the normal range, suggesting that both early and late osteogenesis were either normalized or significantly improved. Despite the nutritional intervention, combined  $\beta$ -Crosslaps levels remained increased.

**Response: Thanks for the comments. The results have been carefully reviewed and corrected according to the reference value. Explanation was included.**

8. “ Figure Legends: Is figure 1 at age 18 months, before low calcium diet? The text states otherwise, needs clarification. Change to “...ribs are sclerotic” not sclerosis. Delete the sentence “There was no tympanic cavity effusion.” As the radiographs do not show whether there is effusion. Figure 2: add the significant findings shown after the diet.

**Response: Thanks for the comments. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

#### 4 LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript’s language will meet our direct publishing needs.

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have asked the native English speaker to edit the manuscript as suggested.**

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the three-year clinical investigation of a Chinese child with craniometaphyseal dysplasia caused by a mutated ANKH gene. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is an interesting manuscript describing positive effects of low calcium

diet on the progression of CMD. However, some sentences or statements need clarifications. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There is 1 table and 3 figures. A total of 11 references are cited, including no references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the CARE Checklist–2016 and Written informed consent. The authors need to provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. However, the highest single-source similarity index showed to be 7% in the CrossCheck report. The authors need to rephrase the repeated parts. According to our policy, and the single-source similarity should be less than 5%. Please rephrase these repeated sentences. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC.

**Response: we have intensively rephrased the text and asked the native English speaker to edit the manuscript. We have provided the Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form provided by your journal website and Copyright License Agreement.**

5 (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. 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;

**Response: We have provided the figures as required.**

(2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing 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;

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

(3) The reference number cited in the text should be superscript;

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

(4) The “Case Presentation” section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the “Case Presentation” section, and add the “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

**Response: Thanks for the comment. We have revised the manuscript as suggested.**

## Round-2

Requests for revision were addressed. There are still some typos like "perscribed" instead of "prescribed" and in the figure legends "...were sclerosis and the..." instead of "...were sclerotic and the..." .

**Response: Thanks for the comments. We have revised accordingly.**