Dear Sir,

The authors thank the reviewers and editors for their critical review. We appreciate that overall, they have found it good. Some of the quarries raised have been answered. All the suggestions have ben incorporated. The complete text has been edited using a professional editing service. But the salient changes have been highlighted in red.

**Science Editor**

The degenerative changes of ligamentum flavum in the pathology of lumbar spinal stenosis were described in detail. The manuscript is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented and the style. Some suggestions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Query</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>It is unacceptable to have more than 3 references from the same journal. To resolve this issue and move forward in the peer-review/publication process, please revise your reference list accordingly</td>
<td>Th authors have revised the manuscript after extensive literature search. One Journal (Spine) had seven references. As per suggestion, not more than three articles from a journal have been cited.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The format of the table should be a three-line table</td>
<td>The table has been formatted to three lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The choice of the references is outdated.</td>
<td>Most old references have been deleted and newer citations have been incorporated as per suggestion. Only few landmark article have been kept. Kindly consider.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)  
**Scientific Quality:** Grade A (Excellent)  
Professional help for editing has been taken for editing the manuscript

**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 Orthopaedics, 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. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, “Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...”.

4. 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. In order to respect and protect the author’s intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is ‘original’, the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2022.

5. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. The figures have been appropriately edited and inserted in text. The table has been formatted to three lines.