

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Quadrilateral Plate Fractures of the Acetabulum: Classification, Approach, Implant Therapy and Related Research Progress" (Manuscript ID: 67627). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Our final revised manuscript is submitted online as supplementary material. Revised portions are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewer's comments are as follows:

Reviewer #1:

1. Response to comment: (the aim and focus of the review is not clearly presented by the authors)

Response: We think your comments are quite reasonable, and we have stated our aims at the end of the introduction.

2. Response to comment: (The review does not seem to be systematic which presents a big flaw. A narrative review needs a better structure to avoid confusions to the readers. )

Response: We express our recognition and heartfelt thanks to your criticism, and reflect on it. We think that the arrangement and labeling of our headings may not be standardized enough, which may easily lead to misunderstanding

and confusion among readers. We should navigate better our focus of the manuscript and do it in a more systematic way, with better structure. We have relabeled and numbered the title and subtitle as follows: Introduction; Definition and Classification ; Operative Approach; Implant Internal Fixation Technique: 1. Kirschner Wire and Screw Fixation 2. Screw-Plate System Internal Fixation 3. Wire Cerclage Technique 4. Titanium Mesh Technique 5. Preoperative Anatomical Shaping Technique; Discussion; Conclusion.

3. Response to comment: (In Table 2, classification of QP fractures should also be summarized for clarification. )

Response: We were very inspired by your suggestion and we have summarized and clarified the classification of QP fractures below Table 2.

4. Response to comment: (The review is missing a section on the potential future perspectives regarding the topic. )

Response: We believe your suggestion is so important and valuable that we have added a paragraph in Discussion to express our own opinions and comments on the future directions.

5. Response to comment: (The figure legends are confusing. The description in Figure 2 cannot be found in the figure. Figure 3 is wrongly numbered as 4.)

Response: We express our admiration and thanks for your careful observation. At the same time, we have corrected and improved these.

Special thanks to you for your good comments.

Reviewer #2:

1. Response to comment: (Introduction/Plan : this section explains clearly the problematics, but we hardly see how you' re going to develop the manuscript. It' d of interest to announce the sections that will be explored in the manuscript. It is unclear if your manuscript has 3 sections (Classification – Operative Approach – Discussion) or 7 sections. )

Response: We express our recognition and heartfelt thanks to your criticism, and reflect on it. We have stated our aims at the end of the introduction. We think that the arrangement and labeling of our headings may not be standardized enough, which may easily lead to misunderstanding and confusion among readers. We have relabeled and numbered the title and subtitle as follows: Introduction; Definition and Classification ; Operative Approach; Implant Internal Fixation Technique: 1.Kirschner Wire and Screw Fixation 2.Screw-Plate System Internal Fixation 3. Wire Cerclage Technique 4.Titanium Mesh Technique5. Preoperative Anatomical Shaping Technique; Discussion; Conclusion.

2. Response to comment: (Classification: As for the Surgical Techniques, an additional Table summarizing the different classifications (with their limitations) would help understanding. )

Response: We think your suggestion makes a lot of sense. As you mentioned before, it may be that our annotations are a little confusing, so that a table

(Table1 Comparison of several classic anterior approaches for QP fractures)

we added did not attract your attention.

3.Response to comment: (Side remarks: > Figures: Fig.2 legend indicates Yellow circle and Red arrow, but these elements are not visible on the pictures. Fig.3 is noted Fig.4 in Figures Legend In "Screw-Plate System Internal Fixation" section, authors' names are written in uppercase.)

Response: We express our admiration and thanks for your careful observation. At the same time, we have corrected and improved these.

Finally, special thanks to you for your good comments.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper.

We appreciate for Editors and Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.