

May 07, 2021

Dennis A Bloomfield and Bao-Gan Peng

Editors-in-Chief

World Journal of Clinical Cases

Dear Editors:

We wish to re-submit the manuscript titled “**Radial nerve recovery following closed nailing of humeral shaft fractures without radial nerve exploration: A retrospective observational study.**” The manuscript ID is 67047.

We thank you and the reviewers for your thoughtful suggestions and insights on the contents of our manuscript. We also appreciate the positive feedback with regards to our content. The manuscript has benefited significantly from these insightful suggestions. I look forward to working with you and the reviewers to move this manuscript closer to publication in the *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

The manuscript has been rechecked and the necessary changes have been made in accordance with the reviewers’ suggestions. The title has been changed and article highlights have been included in the manuscript as suggested. The changes in the revised manuscript has been highlighted in red. The responses to all comments have been prepared and given below.

Thank you for your consideration. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Chung-Pei Chen, MD

Department of Orthopedics,

Cathay General Hospital No. 2,

Lane. 59, Jiancheng Road., Xizhi District,

New Taipei City 221, Taiwan.

Email: nowfornever@gmail.com

Phone: +886-2-28332211

Fax: +886-2-28389404

Responses to reviewer comments:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I read the present manuscript with great interest. This small case series has a great interest and I believe it worth publishing.

⇒ Thank you for your kind remarks on the quality of our work.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript is good. I suggest editing the Conclusions section in abstract to reflect the conclusions from the observations.

⇒ Thank you for your valuable suggestions. We have revised the Conclusions section on the abstract. (Page 03, Line 28)

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The author's writing is in the style of an original article, but the type of submission is a case report. The author described the surgical treatment of more than 70 patients, using extremely simple statistical analysis, which should be an observational study. If you want to submit a paper in the form of a case report, you need to modify the format of the article accordingly.

⇒ Thank you for your valuable suggestion. We have changed the title of the manuscript from "**Radial nerve recovery following closed nailing of humeral shaft fractures without radial nerve exploration: Single-center retrospective case series**" to "**Radial nerve recovery following closed nailing of humeral shaft fractures without radial**

nerve exploration: A retrospective observational study". (Page 01, line 04)

- ⇒ We have changed the manuscript type from "**CASE SERIES**" to "**OBSERVATIONAL STUDY**" (Page 01, Line 02)

The case report does not require limitation, and you need to add image data.

Therefore, my opinion is major revision · and submit the manuscript after revision.

- ⇒ Thank you for your valuable suggestions. We have changed our study type from "**CASE SERIES**" to "**OBSERVATIONAL STUDY**". (Page 01, Line 02)
- ⇒ We have also included the images related to the study with the revised submission. (Page 06, Line 29)

Responses to Science editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study (Not a case report) of the radial nerve recovery following closed nailing of humeral shaft fractures without radial nerve exploration. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Two Grades B and Grade D; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This small case series has a great interest. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered.

⇒ Thank you for your appreciation and kind words. We have carefully reviewed the manuscript and revised it address all the questions raised by the reviewers.

(3) Format: There is 1 table; (4) References: A total of 21 references are cited, including no references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is no self-cited reference; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately.

⇒ Thank you for your valuable suggestion. Since no studies published so far have discussed the primary or secondary radial nerve recovery rate following use of the closed nailing technique, we could use only a few sources from the existing literature as references. However, we have added a few more references to the revised manuscript that were published within the past 3 years (Page 04, Line 11)

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Three Grades A. A language editing certificate issued by Editage was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. 5 Issues raised: (1) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

⇒ Thank you for pointing out the deficiencies. We have added article highlights to the revised version of the manuscript. (Page 11, Line 01)