

22 January 2024

Manuscript No. 89229 (under revising), please submit your revised manuscript online. The revision letter as follows:

Dear Editor-in-Chief,

Below you can see highlighted in yellow color my answers to the Comments made by the Reviewers.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

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

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

First of all, this article appears to be a “letter to the editor” rather than an “editorial.” Although topic is interesting, the writing is very sketchy and does not meet the expected standards of a scientific journal. The English language is poor and requires substantial improvement. Sentences lack clarity in many places, which disrupts the reading flow. I suggest longer sentences can be broken up into smaller sentences to express the point more clearly. For example, the sentence “However, these authors have neglected to mention and include in their list of references four important articles on the subject that which confirm their findings with respect to outcomes but at the same time contradict their conclusion with respect to mortality” can be split into shorter sentences in order to make it clear.

AUTHOR: I have changed practically the whole paper (see the changes highlighted in yellow color). Besides, the writing and the English language have been improved.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors:

I think the editorial is fair in its comments on the article by Ahmed but these comments should have been given to the authors of the original paper so that they can comment on the difference between their study and the previous ones.

AUTHOR: No changes have been made regarding the Comments of this Reviewer.