

ROUND 1

16 May 2023

Prof. Wang
Editor-in-Chief
World Journal of Clinical Cases

Dear Prof. Wang:

We thank you for your letter with the reviewers' comments regarding our manuscript, titled "Integrated Chinese and Western medicine in the treatment of a patient with podocyte infolding glomerulopathy: A case report" (ID: 84123). The comments were valuable and helpful in improving our manuscript; they also provided guidance to our future research.

We have revised the manuscript according to the comment. The major revisions in the manuscript and our responses to the reviewers' comments are provided below. We hope that the revised manuscript is suitable for publication.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Fang Xuan

Department of Nephrology, First Medical Center of Chinese PLA General Hospital, Nephrology Institute of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, State Key Laboratory of Kidney Diseases, National Clinical Research Center for Kidney Diseases, Beijing Key Laboratory of Kidney Disease Research, Beijing 100853, China. xuanfangbasa@qq.com

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I appreciate the great effort of the authors in conducting this study. The study discusses a further case report of PIG with a review of the previously reported cases (40). The article is well-written. I have the following notes to improve the presentation of the study:

1. Each word of the title should be started with a small letter except the first word and the letter "A" after ":" according to the style of the journal.

Response: Thank you for your amendments and suggestions to this article during your busy schedule. We have made corresponding modifications in the manuscript, and the revised title is: *Integrated Chinese and Western medicine in the treatment of a patient*

with podocyte infolding glomerulopathy: A case report

2. Abstract a. Please avoid repetition like "Podocyte infolding glomerulopathy (PIG) is a newly described and rare glomerular disease." you repeated this sentence in the abstract, Core Tip, and introduction. b. Case summary: you should focus on the presentation of the case, diagnosis, treatment, outcome and follow-up. c. Conclusion: I advise you to rewrite it to be informative, i.e. you should focus on the case and its results.

Response: Thank you for your advice, which is very important. We have rewritten the abstract section.

3. Key Words: please add another word to be 6 in number according to the journal style. Besides, each word should be started with a capital letter.

Response: We agree with you very much. We've added the keyword "Corticosteroids therapy" in the manuscript.

4. Introduction a. I think paragraph 2 should be incorporated with the first paragraph because both are discussing the descriptive part of the section. b. These sentences " PIG can be made based on histopathologic findings. Its pathological feature is the presence of microspheres, microtubules, or both in the glomerular basement membrane (GBM) under electron microscopy, and podocytes infolding into the GBM. The pathogenesis and progression of PIG are largely unknown due to the limited number of reported cases. Thus, integrated and definitive immunologic therapies are not yet available. Some case reports suggest that corticosteroids therapy can be used to treat this disease; however, it is difficult to assess its efficacy because of the limited number of cases and the lack of long-term follow-up of cases." need references. c. summarise→ summarize.

Response: We can't agree with you more. We have incorporated the first and second paragraphs and added references in the appropriate places. And we have changed summarise to summarize.

5. Case presentation a. Chief complaints: please mention only the presenting chief complaint. b. pulse is thin. → b. pulse is weak. c. Mild edema → mild edema d. Page 5 Line 21: urinary protein, 3+; → urinary protein = 3+,. Please do the same for other values. e. Imaging examinations should be changed to histological examinations. f. Page 6 Line 8: please delete this "Under an electron microscope" because you already mentioned it. g. Page 6 Line 21: what kind of traditional Chinese medicine you used? h. OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP: need more detail.

Response: We agree with you very much. We have revised the manuscript accordingly to your comments, except for the "f" suggestion, which refers to an electron microscope, not exactly the same as the light microscope mentioned above. I don't know whether my understanding is correct. If it is wrong, please kindly advise me. I will revise it again. Thank you again for your detailed suggestions.

6. Discussion a. Paragraph 4: most of the information is a repetition of the Table 2 content. Please rewrite it again to explain the cause of the results from the previous studies. b. Paragraph 5: please see the above-mentioned note. c. Last paragraph: is it a repetition of what was mentioned in the case presentation? d. Are there limitations to your study?

Response: Thank you for your advice, which is very important. a-c. We have rewritten several paragraphs in the discussion you mentioned. d. As you mentioned in your next question, our study has limitations and we have placed the description of the limitations

in the conclusion in the corresponding place in the discussion.

7. Conclusion: " Nonetheless, the results cannot be generalized as this is a case report, and there is scope for future research in prospective studies and case series. The more case reports on this disease that are published, the more experienced we will be to provide patients with better counseling." These 2 sentences belong to the limitation of the study.

Response: We can't agree you more. We have placed these two sentences at the end of the discussion.

8. Figures a. Figure 1: please substitute panels B, C, and D with colored images. b. Figure 2: 24-h proteinuria→ A 24-h proteinuria.

Response: Thank you for your advice, which is very important. Panels B, C, and D correspond to the images of the electron microscope, the original image of this picture is in black and white. And we have changed the legend of Figure 2.

9. Table 2 a. Please add two columns; one for the country of the study and the other for the year of the study. b. You should add the information of your case (case 41).

Response: We agree with you very much. a. We have added two columns in table 2.

b. We did not include this case in Table 2 for two reasons. On the one hand, the information of this case is in Table 1, and the full text focuses on the description of this case. If it is described again in Table 2, it would be slightly conflicting. On the other hand, Table 2 is mainly described in this literature review, so it seems inappropriate to add this case. I don't know if my understanding is reasonable. If there is any mistake, please give me more advice.

Thank you again for your valuable comments, which have great guiding significance for this paper.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Hello. I read your article in detail. I have some suggestions that can improve your work. The abstract alone is not representative your maniscrip. In the conclusion section, the final sentences of the case summary section are repeated. It is better to write abstract conclusions with short and concise sentences. In the case presentation , the chief complaint should be short and precisely the patient's words. The type of Chinese herbal medicine used and its dosage are not stated. Clinical improvement criteria are not mentioned. Patient recovery has not been compared with other studies. Tables are not explained. It has no measurement unit.

Response: Thank you for your amendments and suggestions to this article during your busy schedule. We have rewritten the abstract section. The types and dosages of Chinese herbal medicine used in the disease process have also been supplemented. Due to the limited number of cases, there is no clear definition of clinical remission criteria in the current literature, and some of the literature only describes cases and does not analyse prognosis, so clinical remission is not defined in this paper, nor is prognosis compared

with existing studies. We have revised the discussion section in more detail and highlighted the descriptive analysis of the tables. Thank you very much for your valuable comments, which have guided this paper greatly.

Thank you again for your patient review and detailed comments on this paper. If there are still problems with the revised article, I would be grateful for your advice.

ROUND 2
25 May 2023

Prof. Fan
Science Editor
World Journal of Clinical Cases

Dear Prof. Fan:

We thank you for your letter with the reviewers' comments regarding our manuscript, titled "Integrated Chinese and Western medicine in the treatment of a patient with podocyte infolding glomerulopathy: A case report" (ID: 84123). The comments were valuable and helpful in improving our manuscript; they also provided guidance to our future research.

We have revised the manuscript according to the comment. The major revisions in the manuscript and our responses to the reviewers' comments are provided below. We hope that the revised manuscript is suitable for publication.

There is another small problem I need to consult, which was also pointed out by the reviewer. Some blue images do not appear in the references in the manuscript I submitted, but they do appear in the file automatically generated by the system, and I wonder if this is a technical problem.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Fang Xuan

Department of Nephrology, First Medical Center of Chinese PLA General Hospital, Nephrology Institute of the Chinese People's Liberation Army, State Key Laboratory of Kidney Diseases, National Clinical Research Center for Kidney Diseases, Beijing Key Laboratory of Kidney Disease Research, Beijing 100853, China. xuanfangbasa@qq.com

Specific Comments to Authors:

1. Introduction: Write the full term of the abbreviation "PIG" as it appeared first here.

Response: Thank you for your amendments and suggestions to this article during your busy schedule. We have written the full term of the abbreviation "PIG" in the section of introduction in the manuscript.

2. Tables: Should be redesigned according to the journal style (Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical

lines and do not segment cell content.).

Response: We have modified the tables to a three-line tables that meets the requirements of this journal.

3. Discussion: Paragraph 8 is a repetition of the case presentation and it adds nothing to the discussion.

Response: We agree with you very much. The eighth paragraph of the discussion section is indeed our review and summary of this case again. We intend to emphasize it, but it does have the problem of being repetitive and redundant, so we would like to hear your opinion on whether we can consider removing this paragraph.

4. Please remove the unwanted blue figures from the reference list.

Response: We are very sorry for the trouble caused to you. These blue images are not in the references in my manuscript submission, but they are in the file automatically generated by the system. I will communicate with the editor to see if there is a technical problem and solve it.

Thank you again for your patient review and detailed comments on this paper. If there are still problems with the revised article, I would be grateful for your advice.