

Dear Editor,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript. We appreciate the time and effort that you and the reviewers dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on and valuable improvements to our paper. We have incorporated most of the suggestions made by the reviewers. Please see below for a point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments and concerns.

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

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

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:**

1. The selection of the topic is meaningful and innovative; the final results are significantly different; and the analysis is also performed for both genders.

**Response:** Thank you for the encouraging comments.

2. The methodological content inside the abstract should not only explain how to measure and the principle of measurement but should also provide a summary of the whole trial, from the inclusion of patients to the results of the whole period of the protocol.

**Response:** Inclusion and exclusion criteria of patients were added to the methodological content of the abstract upon recommendation.

3. Whether there is a significant difference in the baseline characteristics of the pre-experimental artery flow between the control and experimental groups, not mentioned

**Response:** According to your recommendation, if there is a significant difference in flow velocity and artery diameters between the pre-stimulus control and study groups, it has been added to the results section.

4. The language of the article should be further embellished.

**Response:** The language editing of the manuscript was performed by a native speaker.

5. Inclusion Exclusion criteria are an important part of an article, and details should be presented in the text or in an attachment. What diagnostic criteria for IBS were used? Were some patients with significant anxiety and depression included?

**Response:** Upon your suggestion, the diagnostic criteria used for IBS, the inclusion or exclusion criteria of patients, and some patient groups that were not included in the study were added to the material and method section.

Reviewer #2:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The authors investigated brachial artery doppler sonographic readings in IBS patients and controls. While the study is interesting, I have some questions and comments.

1. The authors failed to mention whether diabetes mellitus patients were excluded from the study. As diabetes patients frequently have neuropathy, especially autonomic neuropathy, this should be mentioned.

**Response:**

Because diabetic individuals frequently have neuropathy, particularly autonomic neuropathy, this patient category has been removed from the study in the material and methods section, per your advice.

2. The conclusions in the Abstract does not fit with the manuscript. For example, "This method is regarded more beneficial to the patient than typical autonomic neuropathy treatments, such as the Valsalva maneuver and ice application." is not supported by the study. Please revise.

**Response:** The abstract's conclusions have been revised in response to your warning.

3. The English, especially the dividing of paragraphs seems to be poor. Please have it checked by a professional English editing service or a native English speaker.

**Response:** The language editing of the manuscript was performed by a native speaker.

***(1) Science editor:***

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

***(2) Company editor-in-chief:***

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Radiology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before its final acceptance, please upload the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board's official approval in official language of the authors' country to the system. Before final acceptance, uniform presentation should be used for figures showing the same or similar contents; for example, "Figure 1 Pathological changes of atrophic gastritis after treatment. A: ...; B: ...; C: ...; D: ...; E: ...; F: ...; G: ...". Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author's intellectual property rights and prevent others from misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2023. 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. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

**Response:** References were rearranged according to the suggestions. Thank you for taking the time to evaluate our work and for your valuable comments.