

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Adult Patients with Allied Disorders of Hirschsprung's Disease in the Emergency Department: An 11-year Retrospective Study" (ID: 70826). These 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 and made correction carefully. The changes in the revised manuscript have been highlighted in yellow. You can find point-by-point responses as following and we hope it can fully address your concerns. Our revised manuscript has been polished further by a professional English language editing institute. A new language certificate along with the revised manuscript has been provided.

Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: The article is within the scope of the journal. It is well written and structured. The results that have been obtained are valuable for the area of knowledge. The data analysis was successful. The only suggestion for improvement would be the need to add a section of conclusions and future work in which the scientific contributions of the article are synthesized and the lines of future work are indicated.

Response: Thank you very much for your comments and the suggestion. We have added the corresponding content "We believe that these findings are beneficial for emergency clinicians to make appropriate suspected diagnoses earlier and reduce misdiagnosis and mistreatment of adult patients with ADHD. In the future, a large-scale study will be used to verify our results and discover more powerful models for ADHD. In addition, we will follow up with the patients for a longer period, including postoperative quality of life, comparison of nutritional status before and after surgery.

Future work requires more in-depth research on the molecular mechanisms, signal pathways, and biomarkers of ADHD” in the conclusion part, with changes being highlighted in yellow.

Reviewer #2:

1. The title reflect the main subject about Hirschsprung’s Disease in ED, title was clear and easy to understand.

Response: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and making great comment.

2. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript.

Response: Thanks for your great comment.

3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.

Response: Thanks.

4. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status, and significance of the study. Introduction part, the authors explain history and type of ADHD with reason to meet this disease in ED. I suggest the authors explain prevalence data in abdominal with ADHD in ED or data to promote your sentence "It is hard for most ED doctors to associate common abdominal symptoms with ADHD specifically". Many studies showed about revisit abdominal pain in ED but in ADHD was little study.

Response: Thanks for your great suggestion. We have added the text “Many studies showed about revisit abdominal symptoms in ED ^[11-14], but there was little data yet in ADHD” before the sentence “It is hard for most ED doctors to associate common abdominal symptoms with ADHD specifically" in introduction part, with changes being highlighted in yellow.

5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects were clear, with demonstrate IRB number or text to human ethics consideration. I suggest the authors delete exclusion criteria with patients aged less than 18 years old because your inclusion criteria show this meaning.

Response: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing. We have deleted the content “1) patients aged less than 18 years” in materials and methods part, with changes being highlighted in yellow.

6. The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study.

Response: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and making great comments.

7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly, and logically. In discussion part, the authors explain "no specific blood index has been reported to identify ADHD", I suggest the authors show the novel discovery tool from this study to help doctor in ED in diagnosis ADHD.

Response: Great suggestion. We have added the corresponding content “Our regression model shows that BMI, cholinesterase, and blood chlorine have good discrimination between ADHD and IBS (AUROC=0.812)” in discussion part, with changes being highlighted in yellow.

8. Tables and figures sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents.

Response: Thanks for your great comment.

9. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics.

Response: Thanks.

10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important, and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.

Response: Thanks for your great comment.

Responds to the editor's comments:

Science editor: Please, reply to all the comments raised by the reviewers and amend the manuscript accordingly. If possible, increase the size of the text in figure 2 so graph labels can be easily read.

Response: Thanks for the helpful suggestion. We have replied to all the comments raised by the reviewers and amended the manuscript carefully. The size of the text in figure 2 has been increased now.

We appreciate for your warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.