

ANSWER TO REVIEWERS

Specific Comments To Authors: Authors reported a mentally retarded male patient with sequelae of cerebral palsy with bilateral femoral neck fracture after grand mal epileptic seizure. This is a truly rare case and worth to be published. The only one suggestion is it would be great if authors could provide more x-rays postoperatively, especially the fracture close union and/or union ones.

Answer: I added anteroposterior radiographs after callus formation as you requested.

Specific Comments To Authors: “Mentally retarded” is not a favoured expression and ‘developmentally delayed’ is the current vogue. “antiepileptic” is no longer used but rather ‘antiseizure medication’ “deep vitamin D deficiency” has no definitive meaning. I presume the author(s) mean ‘significant’ Vit D deficiency. “an epileptic patient” is unacceptable and ‘a person with epilepsy’ is far more acceptable. “In this study, we aimed to present...” should read ‘This report presents...’. I have already mentioned not to use “mentally retarded”. “epileptic male” should read ‘male with epilepsy’. “Our patient...” should read ‘The patient...’ “is a chronic antiepileptic user of valproic acid...” should read ‘has used the antiseizure medication, valproic acid for a long time...’. The term, “Grand mal” is no longer in vogue and should read ‘generalised tonic clonic seizure’. “quite low” in relation to Vit D really means very little and a level should be reported. As a neurologist I cannot comment on the technical aspects of the orthopaedic intervention. When offering the values, such as that on Vit D, it would be useful to quote the units as I am familiar with Vit D ≥ 70 , nmol/L which does not concur with that reported by the authors. “secondary to antiepileptic treatment” should read ‘secondary to use of antiseizure medications’. “We have presented...” should be in third person past tense rather than first person. “antiepileptic drugs” should read ‘antiseizure medications’. “secondary to epileptic seizure...” should read ‘secondary to an epileptic seizure...’. “Similarly, in our case...” should read ‘This case...’ “we think that the femoral neck fracture” which follows the previous quotation in the last point raised, should read ‘This case suggests that the femoral neck fracture...’ “use of antiepileptic drugs. However, we think that the long-term use of valproic acid used in antiepileptic therapy have facilitated...” should read ‘use of antiseizure medication. The long term use of valproic acid

as antiseizure therapy has facilitated...' "At the same time, unlike the literature, the immobile status of our patient can..." should read 'The patient's immobility...' as the authors use too many superfluous words that are completely unnecessary and add nothing to the context of the paper. "In another study conducted in our country,..." should simply state the country involved and avoid first person referencing. Commentary on the orthopaedic services is out side my area of expertise. "doubt in epileptic patients..." should read 'doubt in people with epilepsy..'. "Since the use of antiepileptic drugs may decrease bone density..." should read 'As antiseizure medication may...' and then same applies to later in the sentence . "we think that bone-sparing surgeries..." should read 'it is argued that bone-sparing surgery...'. The paper demands revision in the light of these comments but it has a definite message to send to the readers and for that purpose, with the requested revisions, is suitable for publication.

Answer: I revised the language as much as possible as you wanted.