

Dear Reviewer,

It's an honor to receive your comments on my manuscript (Manuscript NO.:67032, Case Report).

We have resolved all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the peer-review report(s) and responded to each of the issues point-by-point, which are listed below:

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: 1. An usual finding of duodenal perforation from organophosphate poisoning. 2. It is worth reporting as a high index of suspicion is required to diagnose such an unusual occurrence Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent) Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing) Conclusion: Minor revision

response #1: We have polished language again.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I have the read the manuscript with great interest. The manuscript is well written and very interesting. However, I suggest the authors to make some minor corrections which provide completeness of the article. 1. Background section: Do not use terms such as etc. in the manuscript. 2. Discussion section: Provide the gastrointestinal manifestations of OP poisoning on imaging. 3. Elaborate other causes of duodenal perforation. As references add to the strength of the manuscript, I

would recommend citing the below mentioned articles: Donald KJ, Doherty SR, Shun A. Duodenal perforation: an interesting case report. Emerg Med Australas. 2005;17(1):46-48. doi:10.1111/j.1742-6723.2005.00695.x

Ravikanth R, Sandeep S, Philip B. Acute Yellow Phosphorus Poisoning Causing Fulminant Hepatic Failure with Parenchymal Hemorrhages and Contained Duodenal Perforation. Indian J Crit Care Med. 2017;21(4):238-242. doi:10.4103/ijccm.IJCCM_410_16

4. Remove the term "Case Report" from Keywords.

5. Figure 1: Mention the sites of pseudocyst as tail of pancreas and lesser sac. Denote the same in the figure by using arrows.

6. Do not use the term "Doctors" in the manuscript. Replace the term with "Clinicians".

7. Conclusion section - the sentence "In the clinic, many factors can induce duodenal perforation." needs to be elaborated / rewritten. Do not use sentences which require further literature review especially in the conclusion section.

response #2:

2.1: Background section: we deleted etc.

2.2: Discussion section: we Provided the gastrointestinal manifestations of OP poisoning on imaging.

2.3 We elaborated other causes of duodenal perforation.

2.4 We removed the term "Case Report" from Keywords.

2.5 We denoted the sites of pseudocyst as tail of pancreas in the figure by using arrows.

2.6. We used "clinician" instead of "doctor".

2.7. Conclusion section: we rewritten the sentence "In the clinic, many factors can induce duodenal perforation."

LANGUAGE QUALITY

response : we resolved all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report, and the manuscript's language will meet your direct publishing needs.

ABBREVIATIONS

response :We took abbreviations as rules.

Yours

Sincerely

Lu-ying Zhang