

Dear editor:

Enclosed please find the revised manuscript **No.59833** "Osseous Rosai-Dorfman Disease of tibia in children: a case report and literature review". We greatly appreciate the comments and have learned a lot from the reviewers. The critics have been addressed as following.

Reviewer Comments:

1. English language should be thoroughly checked, please pay attention to grammatical, expressive and tense errors.

A: Sorry for the errors, we check through the entire manuscript, revise the errors and marked **RED**.

2. The background section of the abstract is not really relevant to this manuscript. Please rewrite this part.

A: Thank you for the considerate remind, we rewrite that part and marked **RED**.

3. More detailed description needs to be included in the figure legends.

A: Thank you for the considerate remind, we rewrite the figure legends.

4. Table 1 need to be confirmed: The author writes that: "no more than 7 cases of primary intra-osseous RDD of tibia have been described in the English literature". However, Table 1 showed 7 publications including 12 cases. Reference 15 "Primary Rosai-Dorfman Disease of Bone A Clinicopathologic Study of 15 Cases" which reported some tibia cases as well should be included in Table 1? Please check literature thoroughly to complete this Table. If RDD of tibia is summarized, the difference between RDD of tibia and other RDD of bone may be interesting to discuss.

A: Thank you for your considerate reminder, we have already included this reference as author Demicco EG, but we used a wrong reference number, we modified and marked **RED**.

5. Reference [25] is cited in the text in the first paragraph of Discussion, but there is no "reference 25" in the reference list.

A: Sorry we used a wrong reference number, we modified and marked **RED**.

6. The author states that: "The occurrence of RDD along with Primary involvement of bone is rare, estimated at 2-8% of cases [8]". However, there is no clue of this aspect in the reference 8. Please confirm if the correct reference is cited.

A: Sorry we list our reference number by mistake, we re-list and marked **RED**.

7. The discussion section needs to be modified.: The focus of this manuscript is to highlight the diagnosis and treatment of RDD of bone in children. Therefore, the emphasis should be on the diagnosis and differential diagnosis of pediatric bone tumors. The authors provide an extensive introduction to the general knowledge of RDD, but there is a lack of focused discussions of pediatric RDD. Radiological examination plays a crucial role in the diagnosis of pediatric RDD,

more discussion regarding this aspect need to be added. Which methods are preferred? Which imaging features should be noted? Which conditions should be considered for surgical treatment? For pediatric RDD of bone, especially for children who have been performed surgery, the postoperative recovery and long-term results need to be discussed. What is the difference between pediatric and adult surgery? Does it affect growth and development? What is the possibility of recurrence? What are the treatment strategies for recurrent RDD of bone? The author states that “most of the authors consider it a benign, proliferative, and self-limited process with excellent prognosis [13-14]”. However, these two references are from the discoverers of the disease (Rosai J and Dorfman RF) which are too old to illustrate this point. Please update latest opinions. The author states that: “In a recent case series of osseous RDD, the cranium (31%), facial bones (22%), and tibia (18%) were most commonly affected, followed by the spine/sacrum, femur, and pelvis”. References 9 are missing here Please confirm reference 11 where it is cited, is not really relevant to the content. The author writes that: “In some cases affected individuals have shown improvement of symptoms with these treatments. In other cases, drug therapies seem to be ineffective, the treatment is directed to solve specific symptoms that are apparent in each individual.” References are missing and message is unclear in this paragraph.

A: Thank you for your thoughtful opinion, we modified the discussion part and marked **RED**. The responsible reference was modified and marked **RED**

We feel that these changes are more persuasive and strongly support our statement in the manuscript. We hope the reviewers agree with our answers and the new version of this manuscript meets the standard of the prestigious Journal of Pediatric Orthopaedics B .Thank you very much for your consideration.

Sincerely yours

Jie WEN & Sheng XIAO

Hunan Provincial People's Hospital