

Dear Dr. Zhang and Reviewers,

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "The value of dynamic plasma cell-free DNA monitoring in a case report on septic shock syndrome" (NO: 51190) submitted to World Journal of Clinical Cases. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and provided point-by-point responses to the comments from our reviewers. Revised portions are marked in yellow in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewer's comments are as follows.

Thank you again for the opportunity to contribute to World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Yours sincerely,

Shi-Yang Pan, PhD, Professor

Department of Laboratory Medicine

The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University

300 Guangzhou Road

Nanjing, 210029, China

Tel: +86 25 68303450

E-mail: sypan@njmu.edu.cn

Answers to editor:

We have added a running title (cell-free DNA in septic shock syndrome) in Page 1, line 4.

Answers to reviewers' comments:

Reviewer 1

"good study. Authors need to study more cases and confirm these initial findings."

Response: Thank you for the positive comments. This paper is only a case report, which simply suggests that cfDNA may be a promising marker that complements other inflammatory factors in monitoring the progression of septic shock. While patients died of septic shock in our hospital are rare, we are applying for a large sample of clinical trials to further confirm the value of cfDNA in septic shock.

Reviewer 2

1 "Discussion section: please, mention the strengths and limitations of the manuscript."

Response: Thank you for your valuable suggestion. The strengths of the manuscript are that we use our specific duplex real-time PCR assay with internal control to

measure plasma cfDNA during whole course of the disease. Our study suggests that cfDNA may be a promising marker that complements other inflammatory factors in monitoring the progression of septic shock. We have mentioned this in Page 8, lines 220-239.

Concerning limitations, we thank our reviewer for the good suggestion, and have added following information in Page 8, lines 239-241.

While patients died of septic shock in our hospital are rare, the conclusion of our study is based on only one case. In future, we will conduct large-scale clinical trials to confirm the value of cfDNA in septic shock.

2 “Please, read carefully the format of references and make corrections.”

Response: We have checked carefully and corrected the references mistakes. Corrections were marked in yellow in the manuscript.