Answering Reviewer and Editors

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I think the authors did a good job, I appreciate the research of literature and the dedication they have had for this article

Specific Comments to Authors: I think the authors did a good job, I appreciate the research of literature and the dedication they have had for this article

Response: Thanks very much for your precious evaluation.

1. Language polishing requirement for revised manuscript
Response: We have polished the manuscript through professional English language editing company, and a new language certificate is provided along with the manuscript.

2. Science editor:

Specific Comments To Authors: The manuscript elaborated a case of a novel osteotomy combined with the trephine technique which effectively addressed an invisible implant fracture 5.1mm beneath the alveolar crest. The manuscript is well written and can be helpful for the readers to ameliorate the diagnostic and therapeutic approach for this scenario. I don't have any major modification suggestions. Do I want to know the disadvantages of this technology? Scientific Quality: Grade B Language Quality: Grade B Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: Thank you for the kind review. The disadvantages of this technology were emphasized at the last of the discussion part. The limitation of this technique is that immediate implantation cannot be achieved owing to insufficient primary stability. Therefore, this technique must be used in conjunction with delayed implantation, which is more time-consuming.

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

Response: We have used uniform presentation for figures showing the same or similar contents. All the original figure documents were prepared and arranged in PowerPoint. The figures are original, none of the figures were generated by other authors or published elsewhere. We added the copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture. There is no funding of this article, thus we did not upload any approved grant application form.