

Reviewer #1:

*Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)*

*Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

*Conclusion: Minor revision*

*Specific Comments to Authors:*

- *Comments:*
- *In page 3: the phrase “normal bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy” should be revised.*
- *What is the type of sedation given to the patient during Transvaginal ultrasound-guided tunnel puncture and multiple lauromacrogol injections?*
- *What is the number and where were the sites of lauromacrogol injections? And how many ml were injected in each site? This should be mentioned in details.*
- *Pictures are of poor quality.*
- *Any articles in literature describing the side effects of lauromacrogol especially if accidentally injected directly inside a vessel and distributed in the systemic circulation?*

Dear Reviewers:

Thank you for yours comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Effectiveness and Safety of Ultrasound-Guided Intramuscular Lauromacrogol Injection Combined with Hysteroscopy at the Treatment of Cervical Pregnancy: A Case Report and Literature Review” (ID: 72615). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval.

Response to comment:

1.in page 3: the phrase “normal bilateral salpingo-oophorectomy” should be revised.

•", We are very sorry for our incorrect writing.we have corrected this expression,and marked in red in revised paper.

2. What is the type of sedation given to the patient during Transvaginal ultrasound-guided tunnel puncture and multiple lauromacrogol injections? • What is the number and where were the sites of lauromacrogol injections? And how many ml were injected in each site? This should be mentioned in details.

Considering yours suggestion, we have added the details in the Methods.

3. Any articles in literature describing the side effects of lauromacrogol especially if accidentally injected directly inside a vessel and distributed in the systemic circulation?

Response: Yes, we have added this part.

Yongju Ye

Reviewer #2:

*Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)*

*Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

*Conclusion: Minor revision*

*Specific Comments to Authors:* Dear Author: A) Figures 1,2,3,4,6 should be cut off and unnecessary information removed, and picture angles should be corrected. B) As a figure legend, information such as the location and shape of the lesion in relation to the examination images in Figures 1,2,3,4,6 should be shared. C) Figure 5 should not be used as a pathology report; instead, only images should be shared, with the report text serving as the figure legend.

Dear Reviewers:

Thank you very much for your comments and suggestions, Those comments are all valuable and improving our paper, We are very sorry for our negligence of our Figures . We have made correction according to yours comments.

With kind regards,

Yongju Ye

Reviewer #3:

*Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)*

*Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

*Conclusion: Minor revision*

*Specific Comments to Authors:* Figures 1-4 and 6 are cropped. It should be better not see the margins of the monitor/paper. Authors should change figure 5 with a high quality scan, or an image taken directly from the microscope. Indexes (1) and (2) in text are correct? - they have a different style Include, in the introductory part, another roles of POCUS ultrasound. Cite: - Ilie M, Rusu M, Rosianu CG, et al. Ultrasound-guided biopsy in focal liver lesions. Arch Balk Med Union 2018; 53(3):364-368. DOI 10.31688/ABMU.2018.53.3.08. - Constantin V, Carap AC, Zaharia L, et al. High correlation of lung ultrasound and chest X-ray after tube drainage in patients with primary spontaneous pneumothorax: can we omit X-rays for tube management? Eur Surg, 2015, 47(4): 175-180, ISSN 1682-8631 DOI 10.1007/s10353-015-0333-9.

Dear Reviewers:

Thank you for your comments, those comments are very helpful for revising and improving our paper.

Response to comment: Figures 1-4 and 6 are cropped. It should be better not see the margins of the monitor/paper. Authors should change figure 5 with a high quality scan, or an image taken directly from the microscope. Response to comment: We are very sorry for our Figures . We have made correction according to yours comments.

"Indexes (1) and (2) in text are correct?"

Response to comment: It is really true as Reviewer suggested that The author mentioned "Indexes (1) and (2) in text are correct?" We have looked up information according to our paper and made correction according to the Reviewer's comments.

Best regards,

Yongju Ye