

Response to reviewers

Reviewer 1:

1. In Materials and Methods, in the "Treatment" section the authors talk about "critically ill Children" but the classification of patients in non-critical, critical and extremely critical is presented in the next section "Data collection"; for this reason, it is necessary to invert the two paragraphs, illustrating first "Data collection" and then "Treatment".

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. Your suggestion makes our article more logical. We have revised it in the manuscript.

2. In Materials and Methods, the Authors talk about the treatment but there is no comparison between the treatment carried out and the survival rate of the patients; if it is not the subject of the study, less importance should be given to treatment.

Answer: Thank you for your kind advice. Indeed, the treatment wasn't the subject of the study. However, we want to share our treatment experience with readers from all over the world, especially in countries with less paraquat poisoning patients. So, we think it is necessary to keep the detailed treatments.

3. It would be interesting to evaluate the incidence of APP in the different years of study; is it ever growing as indicated in the introduction?

Answer: Thank you for your interesting advice. We showed the incidence of APP in the different years in the next table.

Incidence of APP in the different years

| Year | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 |
|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| number | 6 | 18 | 12 | 9 | 17 | 15 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 4 |

It seems that the incidence of APP was decreased in 2018-2020, which may be related to the national control of pesticides and the increased public awareness of paraquat toxicity.

Reviewer 2:

1. The conclusion to the reader not show too much, because results of this study need to be further verified by large-sample and multicenter research.

Answer: Thank you for your kind advice. We rewrote our conclusions in the revised manuscript.

Science editor:

1. The prediction model is relatively simple and the verification work is not enough. It is still worthy of multi-center and large sample verification.

Answer: Thank you for your advice. Indeed, our study was single-center retrospective study. As we mentioned in the Discussion section, the results of this study need to be further verified by large-sample and multicenter research. We expected other centers validate our results in children with APP.

2. It is unacceptable to have more than 3 references from the same journal. To resolve this issue and move forward in the peer-review/publication process, please revise your reference list accordingly.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised it in the manuscript according to your suggestion.