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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Sondos Majeed,

Thank you for provisionally recommending our manuscript entitled "The patterns of loss of correction after posterior wedge osteotomy in ankylosing spondylitis-related thoracolumbar kyphosis: a minimum of five-year follow-up" (BMSD-D-17-00453R1) for acceptance in BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders.

We have studied editorial comments carefully and tried our best to make necessary corrections. A detailed response to each editorial point raised was provided as follows:

Response to the editorial comments:

1. The editorial comment: We have noticed that you have published your abstract in the EUROSPINE meetings 2017: e-poster abstracts: https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2Fs00586-017-5225-1.pdf, please ensure to cite this as the original source in your manuscript.

Response: Special thanks for your comments. We have cited the e-poster abstracts as the original source in the reference of the manuscript. (Reference section, line 366-368, page 17)

2. The editorial comment: Please include a statement on ethics approval and consent to participate in the “Ethics approval and consent to participate” section of the Declarations. Please include the full name of the ethics committee (and the institute to which it belongs to) that approved the study and the committee’s reference number if appropriate. If you did not need formal ethics approval please confirm that this
complies with national guidelines and provide a reference which supports this. Alternatively, supply a statement that says that a local ethics committee ruled that no formal ethics approval was required in this particular case.

Please also confirm whether informed consent, written or verbal, was obtained from all participants and clearly state this in your manuscript. If verbal, please state the reason and whether the ethics committee approved this procedure. If the need for consent was waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this, including the name of the IRB or a reference to the relevant legislation.

Response: Thank you for your comments. This study was approved by the Medical Ethics Committee of Medical School of Nanjing University (the ethics approval number provided by the board was 2011052). Written informed consent was obtained from all patients prior to testing. (Methods section, line 81-83, page 4; Declarations, line 288-290, page 14)

3. The editorial comment: Please note that the ‘Funding’ section of the declaration is to declare any sources of funding obtained for the research reported in your manuscript; therefore please revise your funding section. If no funding was obtained for your study we still require this section to be included with the statement “No funding was obtained for this study”.

Response: The funding section was revised and all the sources of funding obtained for the current study were declared. (Funding section, line 316-318, page 15)

4. The editorial comment: Please remove the funding information from the Acknowledgements and include it in the Funding section instead. If you have no further acknowledgements please put “Not Applicable” in the Acknowledgements section.

Response: Thank you for your comments. The funding information has been removed from the Acknowledgements themselves and added in the Funding section instead. In the acknowledgement, we would like to thank all the sources of funding for their financial supports. (Funding section, line 311-313, page 15; Acknowledgements section, line 305-308, page 14)

5. The editorial comment: Please remove the funding and competing interests information from the title page as this should only appear in the Declarations.

Response: The funding and competing interests information has been removed from the title page.

6. The editorial comment: Figures should be provided as separate files, and each figure of a manuscript should be submitted as a single file. Figure files should contain only the image/graphic, as well as any associated keys/annotations. If titles/legends are present within the figure files, please remove them. Additionally, please provide figure titles/legends under a separate heading of ‘Figure Legends’ after the
References. If Figure titles/legends are within the main text of the manuscript, please move them.

Response: All the figures have been uploaded as separate files and the related titles/legends have been provided under a separate heading of 'Figure Legends' after the References. (Figure Legends, line 407-425, page 19-20)

7. The editorial comment: In the availability of data and materials section, you have stated that “All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this article”. Please note that the Availability of data and materials refers to the raw data generated and used for this study. Please clarify and confirm whether all the raw data generated for your study is in fact presented in the manuscript, otherwise please state who can be contacted to request the raw data upon request.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We would like to confirm that the Availability of data and materials refers to the raw data generated and used for this study. Meanwhile, the datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request. (Availability of data and materials, line 296-299, page 14)

We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers again for comments on our paper. We hope that the revision is acceptable and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Best wishes