

Dear Jia-Ping Yan

Thank you and the reviewers for giving me the opportunity to revise my manuscript entitled “A minimally-invasive surgical treatment for multiple axis fractures: A case report”. Manuscript NO: 45061. I have carefully studied the comments raised by the reviewers and editors, and revised the paper accordingly. The following are point-by-point responses to the editors’ and reviewers’ comments. All the modifications have been highlighted in light blue in the revised manuscript. In addition, I add two images in figure 1 and four images in figure 2 for better elaborating on the case.

If you have any questions, please contact me without hesitation. I'm looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

To Reviewer # 1:

There is a little bit concern regarding the fracture union. It will be helpful if authors can check and show some different view reconstructed CT images of the odontoid and C2 pedicle.

Answer: I appreciate your suggestion and also think the information is necessary. I add two images in figure 1 and four images in figure 2 for better elaborating on the fracture union of C2.

To Reviewer # 2:

1. Please add the aim of the paper after the background.

Answer: Thanks very much for mentioning this. I add the aim of the paper after the background. Some content of the background has been modified.

2. In the case summary, the follow-up period should be mentioned.

Answer: Thank you very much for the suggestion. I add the follow-up period in the case summary.

3. Introduction should be more developed, it is too short, and should be more referenced, it contains only 4 references.

Answer: I appreciate your suggestion and also think it is necessary to make the introduction more developed. I add more references and content in the introduction.

4. Case description: In this section explicitly should be mentioned that the consensus has been obtained.

Answer: Thanks very much for mentioning this, I have modified the case description.

5. I appreciate if the “signed Informed consent form” to be available also in English.

Answer: I'm really sorry for lack of informed consent form in English, because the popularity of English is relatively low in our city. This patient did not sign an English informed consent form.

6. The case description should be more use more adequate and medical terminology.

Answer: I appreciate your advice. I have revised the description of the case.

7. Conclusion: The efficacy of this treatment should not be generalized, and re-dimensioned. Authors should report that the efficacy of this treatment should be tested on larger samples before claiming its efficacy.

Answer: Thanks very much for your professional advice. I quite agree with you. I have revised the conclusion.

8. The quality of the figures should be improved. Moreover arrows with the figure are needed to indicate better the description of each figure.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. I have rearranged the figures and added some CT images for better elaborating the details of C2. The arrows have been added to the figures to describe them better.

To Reviewer # 3:

1. The authors need to provide right and left midsagittal CT images that clearly show the Hangman fracture.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. Two more CT images were added to show the Hangman fracture.

2. The authors need to put in the discussion another surgical option for these fracture C2-3 ACDF.

Answer: Thank you for professional advice. I have added the discussion about the surgical option of C2-3 ACDF for these fracture.