

Dear Editor, Dear reviewers

Thank you for your letter dated September 13, 2022. We were pleased to know that our work was rated as potentially acceptable for publication in *World Journal of Clinical Cases*, subject to appropriate revision. We thank the reviewers for the time and effort that they have put into reviewing the previous version of the manuscript. Their suggestions have enabled us to improve our work. Based on the instructions provided in your letter, we uploaded the file of the revised manuscript. The comments are reproduced and our point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments are given directly afterward in a different color (red). We would like also to thank you for allowing us to resubmit a revised copy of the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Corresponding author: Bo Chen

The People's Hospital of Three Gorges University, The First People's Hospital of Yichang, Yichang, China

E-mail: bochen71@yeah.net

Response to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: Thank you for the invite for the review. My observations. 1. The title, abstract and core tip are able to convey the message. 2. A distinction between "protected weight bearing" and "early weight bearing " needs to be made in the introduction section before the aim of the study is set. 3. The cases can be described as Case 1 and Case 2 as a whole. Describing all Case 1 features till follow up followed by Case 2. 4. The images of the implant should be provided. AND its biomechanics explained in a line figure. 5. Line 208. A summary of the comparative studies should be provided in a tabular form.

Q1. The title, abstract and core tip are able to convey the message.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work.

Q2. A distinction between "protected weight bearing" and "early weight bearing " needs to be made in the introduction section before the aim of the study is set.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. As suggested by reviewer, we have added the suggested content to the manuscript.

Q3. The cases can be described as Case 1 and Case 2 as a whole. Describing all Case 1 features till follow up followed by Case 2.

Response: Thank you for your comments. Case presentation in our manuscript refers to the format of the paper (Clinical features and literature review related to the material differences in thread rhinoplasty: Two case reports. DOI: 10.12998/wjcc.v9.i31.9635) published by *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

Q4. The images of the implant should be provided. AND its biomechanics explained in a line figure.

Response: We deeply appreciate the reviewer's suggestion. We have added a image of

the implant in Fig.3 of revised manuscript. At present,there are few biomechanical studies on NPC. Supporting biomechanical and finite element analysis of modified nail plate combination (NPC) will be our future research.

Q5. Line 208. A summary of the comparative studies should be provided in a tabular form.

Response: We are extremely grateful to reviewer for pointing out this problem.we have provided a comparative outcome data in a tabular form.

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors has described a modified technique which is combination of nailing and plate combination fixation for periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures in elderly osteoporotic patients. The authors has also described its advantages. I am noted few short coming while reviewing the manuscript. Abstract and Introduction: looks good Case description: Needs further polishing. the surgical duration, hospital stay has not recorded of both procedures. Discussion: Is too lengthy needs brevity. The discussion should focus the comparison of this technique with the already common practiced techniques Over all language and grammar needs improvement.

Q1.The authors has described a modified technique which is combination of nailing and plate combination fixation for periprosthetic supracondylar femur fractures in elderly osteoporotic patients. The authors has also described its advantages. I am noted few short coming while reviewing the manuscript.

Response: Thank you for your summary. We really appreciate your efforts in reviewing our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript accordingly.

Q2. Abstract and Introduction: looks good.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer's positive evaluation of our work.

Q3. Case description: Needs further polishing. the surgical duration, hospital stay has not recorded of both procedures.

Response: Thank you for underlining this deficiency. This section was revised and modified according to the Specific Comments To Authors suggested by the reviewer.The surgical duration and hospital stay has been added to the manuscript.

Q4. Discussion: Is too lengthy needs brevity. The discussion should focus the comparison of this technique with the already common practiced techniques.

Response: Thank you for your precious comments and advice.We first analyzed the predisposing factors for PSFs in this section. In our cases,both of PSFs were found in the elderly osteoporotic patients. Then this section gave a review of the current published literature on the comparison of LP and RIMN. Because of the different shortcomings of the two treatment options in treating PSFs,NPC was developed as a novel method for fracture fixation. Subsequently,the rationale for the use of the NPC was given. Compared to LP or RIMN alone,NPC has its own advantages in clinical outcome and biomechanics analysis. Therefore,the discussion needs so lengthy.Moreover,We have added the comparison of NPC technique with LP, RIMN or dual plating.

Q5. Over all language and grammar needs improvement.

Response: Thank you for your careful review. We are very sorry for the inconvenience they caused in your reading. The manuscript has been thoroughly revised and polished by a professional English language editing company, so we hope it can meet the journal's standard.