

January 27, 2021

Dear Lian-Sheng Ma
Science Editor, Company Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Office
World Journal of Orthopedics

Thank you very much for your prompt review of our manuscript titled "Fracture of ossified Achilles tendons: a review of cases" (Manuscript ID: 62206). We are pleased that the reviewers found it of interest and thank them for their helpful criticisms and comments. Considering their comments, we have made changes to the text and prepared responses to the reviewers. In the revised manuscript, the amended parts are typed in red. We believe the manuscript has been significantly improved by revision, and hope it is now acceptable for publication in *World Journal of Orthopedics*.

Sincerely yours,
Hisatoshi Ishikura, MD
Department of Orthopaedic Surgery,
University of Tokyo,
7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan
Email: hishikura817@gmail.com

Reviewer #1:

#1 Good paper with a sizable review of cases. The paper however needs a good English rewrite with close attention to English grammar, and the use of English "tense". Overall it is well written but it is easy to see it is written by a non-native English speaker.

In consideration of this significant comment by the reviewer, we have rewritten with close attention to English grammar and “tense”. In addition to this, Enago (translation agency) has rechecked my revised manuscript.

#2 Title - Would advise to change the title to: Fracture of ossified Achilles tendons - a review of cases

We thank the reviewer for this helpful comment. We have changed the title to “Fracture of ossified Achilles tendons: a review of cases”.

#3 Throughout the paper, the word "conservative" is used incorrectly. What the authors mean is "nonoperative" care. It is evident throughout the paper and also in Table 1. Each time the word "conservative" should be changed to "nonoperative".

We appreciate this important remark. As the reviewer stated, we replaced the word “conservative” with “nonoperative”.

#4 In the section "Histology of FOAT" - please add a sentence about comparing the histology of FOAT to the histology of heterotopic ossification. The authors may also decide to add a sentence about treatment based upon this comparison of histology.

Thank you for this insightful comment. According to the previous studies, the pathology of FOAT is similar to that of the heterotopic ossification. To support this theory, we have added the following sentences.

“Ossification, not calcification, typically accounts for a great majority of patients with Achilles tendon mineralization. This tendency is consistent with our FOAT cases.” (Page9, Line 185-187)

“These histological findings suggest the occurrence of endochondral ossification, which is consistent with the observation of heterotopic ossifications in other studies.” (Page10, Line 193-195),

In addition to that, we have included another article in a reference list ^[25].

However, in our FOAT cases, the bone structures are often separated by fibrous tissues, and this might be the distinct feature of FOAT. To describe the treatment based upon the comparison of histology, we have added following sentences in the “Histology of FOAT” section. “However, in our FOAT cases, the bone structures are often separated by fibrous tissues. Such a mixed structure may be responsible for its fragility and this might be the distinct feature of FOAT. Given this histological finding, leaving the ossified mass in the FOAT

patients may entail the risk of refracture. Therefore, the fundamentals of treating FOAT should include excision of the ossified mass as much as possible, followed by repairing or reconstructing the tendons.” (Page 10, Line 197-203)

Science editor:

(Issues raised)

#1 The “Author Contributions” section is missing. Please provide the author contributions

We appreciate this important remark. We added the “Author Contributions” section. (Page 1, Line 24-27)

#2 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.

We apologize for that. We have prepared the original picture of figure 1 using PowerPoint so that you can reprocess it. We have submitted the data as “62206-Figures.ppt”