Dear Editor,

Thank you for your letter and advice on our manuscript entitled “Arthroscopic surgery for the treatment of the synovial chondroma of subacromial bursa with non-traumatic shoulder subluxation as the complications: two cases report and literature review”. Accordingly, we have revised the manuscript. All amendments are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript. In addition, point-by-point responses to the comments are listed below this letter. All answers were written in bold text.

We hope that the revision is acceptable for publication in your journal.

Yours sincerely,

The Authors
Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision

Response: Thank you for your positive feedback on our study.

Specific Comments to Authors:

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? I think the title is too long. That's why I recommend shortening it.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have shortened the title and the new title is “Arthroscopic surgery for synovial chondroma of subacromial bursa with non-traumatic shoulder subluxation complications: Two cases and literature review”

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? It is prepared just like a review. Therefore, it should be rewritten according to the case report format.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have rewritten the abstract according to the case report format. In detail,
the Case presentation compartment has been rewritten.

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? It is appropriate to the content of the topic.

Response: Thank you for your positive feedback on our study.

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Looking at the WJCC manual, it appears that the introduction should begin with "Introduction".

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have manage our manuscript begin with "Introduction".

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Case reports were written in an appropriate format. However, subheadings should be written in bold font.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have re-written the subheadings in bold font.

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The case report is appropriately written.

Response: Thank you for your positive feedback on our study.
7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper’s scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? The word "synovial chondromatosis" is used almost entirely in the introduction. However, the discussion part started with the word "synovial osteochondromatosis". If these two words are the same, please use only one to avoid confusion.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. These two words are the same, and we choose the word "synovial chondromatosis" both in the introduction and the discussion part.

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? Appropriate images was used. Image quality should be improved
Response: Thank you for your positive comments. We have provided the original figure documents in a PowerPoint.

9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Biostatistics is not required for this case report.
Response: Thank you for your constructive comments.

10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units?
Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have uploaded SI and will check them according to the requirements of the journal.

11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? I suggest updating the references.
Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have update the references. In detail, we add two references published in recent years.
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(1) Science editor:

The manuscript entitled “Arthroscopic surgery for the treatment of synovial chondroma of subacromial bursa with non-traumatic shoulder subluxation as the complications: Report of two cases and literature review” was read with interest.

Response: Thank you for your positive feedback on our study. Although the study results may be of interest to the global scientific audience, there are flaws that I have pointed out below.

1. The title is too long.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have shorten the title and the new title is Arthroscopic surgery for synovial chondroma of subacromial bursa with non-traumatic shoulder subluxation complications: Two cases and literature review

2. The background of the study is not clear enough for readers.
Response: Thanks for your thoughtful suggestion. We added some information in background and introduced the purpose of this manuscript. 

3. The references need to be updated.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have updated the references. In detail, we added two references published in recent years.
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4. Some minor grammatical errors occur. The manuscript contains language-related issues. Please correct these types of grammatical errors throughout the paper.

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We send the revised manuscript to a professional English language editing
(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

The title of the manuscript is too long and must be shortened to meet the requirement of the journal (Title: The title should be no more than 18 words).

Response: Thank you for your constructive comments. We have shorten the title and the new title is “Arthroscopic surgery for synovial
chondroma of subacromial bursa with non-traumatic shoulder subluxation complications: Two cases and literature review" (no more than 18 words)

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.

Response: Thank you for your positive comments. We have provided the original figure documents in a PowerPoint.

Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response: Thank you for your positive comments. We will upload the approved grant application form(s) and make them meet the requirements of journal.