

## ROUND 1

Thank you very much for your kind e-mail, which gave us the possibility to revise our manuscript. We emended the paper according to the reviewers' comments. We hope this revision will make our manuscript better to be accepted in your journal

Each comment has been answered accordingly in the manuscript. We hope that the revised version will fulfill the requirements for publication.

Thank you very much

Reviewer #1: In the abstract, it is listed as 71/72 fusion rate, but percentage is based off of 70/72 (97.2%).

In total, 70 patients underwent primary fusion, one of whom had a delayed union, which we then counted as a union. Hence the ambiguity with the numbers. We have adjusted this accordingly.

Reviewer #2:

1. The study's title should be changed to reflect the goal for which the current study was designed. In addition, the new title should be free of abbreviations and no longer than twenty words, as this is one of the characteristics of a distinguished title in research.

The goal of the current study was to review our own union rate. Therefore we think the goal of the study is represented well by the title. Less than 20 words and no abbreviations are used.

2. Considering that the most important findings of the current study are included in the results section of the study abstract without extravagance.

We tried to highlight in the abstract that the most important finding is the fusion rate

3. The current study's introduction is very brief and insufficient to fulfill the role of the introduction, which is where you explain briefly and clearly why you are writing the paper. The introduction provides enough context for the reader to understand and evaluate the experiment you conducted. It also provides justification for the study. It was suggested that the introduction be limited to three paragraphs, with the final paragraph highlighting the research problem and how to address it within the framework of the current study's objective.

The introduction has been revised and extended accordingly to your suggestions. I also divided the introduction into three paragraphs as recommended by you

4. What are the references or previous studies on which the researcher relied in support of the surgical technique, postoperative protocol, and radiological assessment? This deficiency must be addressed.

The references regarding the postop protocol, surgical technique and radiological assessment have been added accordingly

5. It is critical to review the progress of the current study's results, as I noticed that the statistical method that was explained in detail in the methods section was not fully followed in the results section, particularly in Tables 1 and 2.

The Confidence interval was not calculated for every parameter but is provided for the most important findings mainly the fusion rate within the full text.

6. One of the final sections of a research paper is the discussion section, in which the author describes, analyzes, and interprets their findings. The discussion section explains the significance of the study results and how they relate to the research question (s). This description is not adequately achieved in the current paper; please review and revise.

The discussion was revised and adapted accordingly to your recommendations. We especially tried to highlight more the significance of the study and their specific findings.

7. Dedicate the final paragraph of the discussion section to highlighting the current study's strengths and weaknesses, as well as answering the question, What are the current study's future directions?

The strengths of the study has been added. Additionally the direction of further research is added.

8. Rewrite the study's conclusion to demonstrate whether the current research problem has been solved in another way. Is the current study's goal achieved?

The conclusion has been adapted accordingly.

9. The references used are very old and not recent, and their number is insignificant in comparison to the significance of the current study. I hope to replace old references with new ones beginning in 2015 and beyond.

Newer and more recent literature has been added. The biomechanical and especially anatomical old studies are nevertheless still valid and not outdated.

10. Does the percentage of plagiarism correspond to what is permitted by the journal's policies?

According to the mail from the publishing group we are well below the limit of plagiarism.

## ROUND 2

1. Yes, I found a file titled "82859-Answering-Reviewers-revision.docx" that answers the reviewers' directives for the research team in the paper, but the other file titled "82859\_Auto\_Edited.docx" doesn't explain what was done. I hope the author(s) would highlight the paper's revisions in "yellow color" or "add comments" on the Word file "82859\_Auto\_Edited.docx" to make follow-up easier to follow up on actually added edits.  
//Good Luck//

Dear Ladies and Gentleman Please find the revised manuscript with the changes highlighted in yellow.