

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The paper is surely interesting and the discussion well developed. The case is rare in children and the manuscript is well and coherently organized. In my opinion the indication to use of 3-dimensional computed tomography should be better explain in the paper: being a pediatric patient, was CT really necessary? Could it have been avoided or replaced with an MRI? The analysis of the pathological mechanism of the fracture is interesting, especially for the comparative analysis with respect to the adult patient. Recommendation: Minor Revisions

Respond: thank you for your advisement. For fracture in children, we generally do not do CT examination before operation. However, this is a rare and unique case. In order to observe the relative position of ulna and radius after injury, we chose three-dimensional CT examination. In the process of CT examination, we have made full radiation protection to the non examination parts of the children, so the amount of radiation received by the children is not much.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I enjoyed reading the article presenting an interesting case of forearm crisscross injury in a child. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript, emphasizing the priority of presenting such a case in children. **The abstract summarizes the case report well, but maybe it would be better to be slightly improved as there are aspects repeated in the Background and Conclusions paragraph.** The keywords were well chosen and reflected the focus of the manuscript correctly. The authors adequately describe in the Background section the field and significance of their case report. The Case presentation respects the steps needed to present the evolution of the case, from diagnosis to treatment and prognostic. The authors interpret the characteristics of their patients compared to data from the literature regarding the adult patients. They highlighted in the Discussions section the critical points of the case logically. The discussion is accurate and discusses the paper's relevance to clinical practice. The case report includes four figures of good quality and appropriately illustrative of the preoperative and postoperative evolution. The authors cited few papers on this type of fracture, not very recent (more than 9 years old). Overall the manuscript is organized, correctly written with an accurate style and language. **Still, there are some typos and editing that should be done. On the last page, some sentences repeated data (the fact that tendons, ligaments, and joint capsules are stronger than the epiphyseal plates). I also would separate the title Discussion from the Conclusions. The authors mentioned informed consent, but the place of writing this in the manuscript seems not logical.**

Respond: thank you for your advisement. We delete some sentences repeated data (the fact that tendons, ligaments, and joint capsules are stronger than the epiphyseal

plates) on the last page. In this time, we separate conclusions from discussion. In addition, informed consent was re-written and was moved to "**Consent for publication**" section.