

Response Letter

Dear Editor

Thank you for comments.

On behalf of my co-authors, we very much appreciate the time and effort you have put into your comments on our manuscript (ID 64042).

We have carefully revised the manuscript. We have submitted a revised version of our manuscript. *All the changes are marked in bold letters. We are more than happy to make any further changes that will improve the paper.*

Thank you again for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Dr Ashish Kumar Jha

MD, DM

Reviewer #1

Comment to Authors-

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments and responses

We thank the reviewer for the assessment of our article.

1. There are some typos in the article, such as " summery", " Miini-review", should it be "summary" and " Minireview" ?

Response-Corrected

2. In my view, M:F=1:9 is better than M:F:1:9. 2.

Response-Changed

3. The sample format of Figure 1 is a bit messy and I cannot read it clearly. In my view, a picture of Figure with a high resolution will be better in the word app. 3.

Response-We are submitting Figure 1 in ppt form.

4. The table in the article should be a three-line table.

Response-Modified

5. The abbreviation of WS appeared in the title of Figure 1, and the full name of WS was suggested.

Response-Changed

6. It is said that wandering spleen was first described by Van Horne in 1667 in this review, and the reference for this point should be provided.

Response-provided

7. The number of references in the past five years is a bit small. There is few contents in the section of Introduction, and it should be more detailed and overviewed.

Response-We revised introduction section. Seven recent publications are added as references.

8. The section of Conclusions just summarized the meanings listed in the article, however, the original opinions of all the authors presented in this review will be great for writing this article.

Response-We revised conclusion.

Reviewer #2

Comments to Authors - Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

As a minireview, it makes sense and is interesting. Image 1 is not provided as an image, but this is an editorial note

Response-Thank you for review of our manuscript.

Modifiable figure 1 submitted.

Reviewer #3

Comments to Authors:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

Some arrows and text boxes of Figure 1 were incorrectly marked.

Response-Thanks you review of manuscript and positive comments. **We corrected figure 1.**

Reviewer#4

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript is well written and the language is good

Response: Thanks you review of manuscript and positive comments.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Thank you for giving us opportunity to revise our manuscript.

Science editor Comments

1.The manuscript makes sense and is interesting and well written. However, the figures need to be revised. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered

Response-We have carefully revised the manuscript.

2. The authors need to provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement.

Response-Provided

3. Language certificate

Response: Our manuscript has been reviewed for clarity by a professional language editing service, so we hope it now matches the journal standard (Certificate attached).

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.

Response-Provided