

Dear editor and reviewers,

We would like to thank you for your and reviewer's consideration and careful check on our manuscript. We are grateful for all the further valuable comments raised by the reviewer. We have carefully revised the manuscript accordingly. The modifications and changes are tracked and highlighted in a version of the revised manuscript. Here, point-by-point responses to the comments raised by the reviewer are listed as follows:

Combined Comments from the editors and reviewers:

1. *This is a very interesting paper, in a very important issue. However, a thorough English language revision is requested. Here below I am listing sentences / fragments that sound awkward to me, and need re-writing possibly from a native-speaking English physician.*

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her appreciation. We have carefully revised the manuscript and made a few modifications depending on the advice from a native-speaking English physician.

2. *Minor comments: " we offered A Hoffman II external fixation and later internal fixation failed to be performed according to the new diagnosis of esophageal cancer"*

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her suggestion in language. We have made changes to the inappropriate words and grammars in this sentence and here is the sentence after modification: "Twenty days after the fasciotomy, we provided a Hoffman Type II external fixator, which was later unable to perform internal fixation based on a new esophageal cancer diagnosis"

3. *Minor comments: "of ankle pulses[2]. Herein," "history is negative for inherent diseases related." "ankle pulse" suggestion: pulsations? "*

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her suggestion. We totally agree that we ought to use "ankle pulsations" instead of "ankle pulses" in describing the patient's condition and all misuse of "ankle pulses" have been revised throughout the manuscript. In addition, we have realized the ambiguous description

like *"history is negative for inherent diseases related."* And we have changed the sentence to "There was no family history of related inherent diseases."

4. *Minor comments: "Thus the patient was definitely diagnosed as rhabdomyolysis. Hemodialysis treatment was not offered due to the normal condition of the patient's kidney."... Offered? Is this the right word? Otherwise: normal renal function....*

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for finding the inappropriate expression. We approve the reviewer's suggestion and we have changed the word "offered" to "given". And the unclear expression "the normal condition of the patient's kidney" has been modified to "normal renal function".

5. *Minor comments: "Seven days after the operation, the right thigh still swollen." "patient turns better." improves? "The Visual Analogue Score dropped from 8 to 4 and the swelling of the right thigh significantly reduced"... Pain VAS?*

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for finding the wrong grammar in the sentence *"the right thigh still swollen"*. We have corrected this mistake and the new expression will be "the right thigh is still swollen."

In addition, we agree with the suggestion that "turn better" ought to be replaced by a more appropriate word "improve". What is more, we have realized our ambiguous expression of VAS and we add its abbreviation in a bracket to make the expression more specific and clear.

6. *Minor comments: "patient's right tibial nerve, common peroneal nerve, superficial peroneal nerve and sural nerve were null.".... Null? Is this the right word (not registered....) "responsible for his self-care.".... independent?*

Response: We are really sorry for the inappropriate word selection. We have agreement with the reviewer's suggestion and we have modified the word "null" to a more specific phrase "negative reaction". Additionally, we take the reviewer's advice and have changed the word "responsible" to "independent" to make our manuscript easier to read.

7. *Minor comments: " peripheral vascular pulses disappear was never mentioned in the above cases of rupture" (disappearance? Which above cases?)*

Response: We really appreciate the reviewer for pointing out another ambiguous point in our manuscript. We have modified the verb “disappear” to its noun version “disappearance”. “the above cases of rupture” were meant to be the cases mentioned in the reference above. In order to avoid misunderstanding, we have modified it to “never mentioned in previous reports of rupture...”

8. *Minor comments: " limp, deep vein thrombosisrenal failure" "helped the patient free of amputation. And the patient finally back to walk on the third year" (Escaped amputation?.... finally back to walk?? Or able to walk...)*

Response: We are really sorry for our unclear expression. To make our thesis and point more clear, we have changed this sentence to “Although missed diagnosis affects the prognosis, timely treatment saves the patient from amputation. In the third year after the operation, the patient was finally able to walk”.

9. *Minor comments: There are some numbers (presumably of references) within the section of Conclusion.... not mentioned in the refs' list. And anyway, starting from 1...2...3... (after more that dozen refs within the text above)*

Response: We really appreciate the reviewer for pointing out the problem in the conclusion section. These numbers are meant to number the five different conclusions made in the article, not references. To avoid misunderstanding, we have changed the numbers’ style to 1. 2. 3..

The whole manuscript has been carefully checked this time. We hope the revisions with substantial improvements would be considered for publication in World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Finally, we want to thank editor and reviewer again for careful and detailed comments.

Yours sincerely,

Minjie Shen M.D.