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Dear Editor,

Thank you for sending us the reviewers’ comments and supportive criticism which we carefully considered in the revision of our manuscript entitled “Primary pyogenic spondylitis following kyphoplasty: a case report”. We hope that this second revision can now be accepted for publication. Attached you find some comments and answers (marked yellow) addressing directly the reviewers suggestions.

Referee Viola Bullmann

Comments to the Author:

Nevertheless there are some points need additional correction. Revision necessary for publication.

1. Introduction: Page 3, Line 1-2: The authors add the prospective randomized vertebroplasty studies as I suggested, published in New England journal. These two studies did not show significant improvement in comparison to the placebo group. Therefor the first sentence of the introduction does not make sence. Please correct to o.g.: Vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty is actually critically discussed in the literature[1-6]
   We did so.

2.) The quality of the additional sentences after revison are not well written English. Please correct these by a native speaker.
   The manuscript was completely revised by a native speaker.

Referee Cornelia Putz

Comments to the Author:

The initial impression of the revised manuscript is favourable and it is acceptable for publication after it has been revised satisfactorily. As some of the reviewers’ recommendation were not answered I would propose to correct the following statements.

page 4, 2nd para: "An operative treatment was recommended, but the patient did not agree at this date due to his bad medical condition."......
3 para: Owing to the clinical progression of neurological symptoms with the development of leg paresis in the following days, the patient gave informed consent to operative treatment and.....

How did you perform the education for operation? Please include that the patient was informed about progression of paralysis. Compression of the spinal cord is a time dependent emergency and early decompression and stabilization state of the art. A "watch and wait strategy" is not really favorable in this case. **We discussed this point in more detail.**

Did the patient present neurogenic bladder and/or bowel dysfunction. Please clarify. **The patient showed no neurogenic bladder and/or bowel dysfunction. We added this point.**

page 5 1st para: correct "complication"
Done.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published 
**The manuscript was completely revised by a native speaker.**

Thank you for your positive assessment of our paper.

Thanks for your comments, editing and proof reading of the manuscript. We have carried out all of your reviewers´ suggestions and look forward to seeing our paper published in the near future. **The manuscript was completely revised by a native speaker.**

Best regards, Markus D Schofer