

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "The surgical strategy used in multilevel cervical disc replacement and cervical hybrid surgery: Four typical case reports" (Ref No. 55580). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet the approval. Revised portion are marked in red in our revised manuscript. The responds to the reviewer's comments are as follows.

Sincerely yours,

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

Comment 1:

Main comment The authors report their surgical strategies claiming that are safe and effective. They have performed 800 CDR and 300 HS procedures However, there no data regarding the cumulative incidence of the effectiveness and of the complications of these procedures. In addition, there is no comparison to other techniques.

Response:

Thank you for your comments. In this study we aimed to share our surgical strategies and surgical procedures in treating multilevel cervical degenerative disc disease in the form of four typical case presentations. Therefore, we did not compare our techniques with other procedures. For the same reason, we did not report the cumulative incidence of the effectiveness and the complications of multilevel cervical spine surgery. This is one of the major limitations of our study. We have added this

information to the Discussion section of the revised manuscript (Page 17, Line 23-27). However, our previous studies have reported the clinical outcomes and safety profile of multilevel cervical spine surgery. We have added this information to the Introduction section of the revised manuscript (Page 7, Line 14-16). Thank you again for your comments.

Comment 2:

Other comments - “such as the NDI score”: provide explanation - ROM: spell out at first instance.

Response:

Thank you for your comments. We have explained the NDI and ROM on the first appearance.

Science Editor:

Comment 1:

Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (9) The “Case Presentation” section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the “Case Presentation” section, and add the “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

Response:

Thank you for pointing out our mistake. We have provided the original figure documents in the PPT file. We have added the “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” sections to the main text.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in our manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. We hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.