

Point-by-Point Response to Reviewer's Comments

We appreciate the time and efforts spent by the editors on our manuscript, and we thank all the reviewers for their careful review, critical comments, and insightful suggestions. In the revised manuscript, we followed the professional suggestions to make a careful revision that helped us to improve our manuscript (please see below).

Please note: any changes we made in the revised manuscript were marked in yellow.

viewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

It was nicely written and analyzed study. Please mention few limitations of the study and recommendations too. Please mention separate conclusion section. Table 2 and 3 has different number of participants in study and control group than mentioned in methodology.

Response: Thank you for the positive and insightful comments by the reviewer on our work. Based on the reviewer's comments, we carefully restructured the manuscript and modified the entire article with a deeper and more coherent perspective. The number of participants in table 2 and 3 was revised. For specifics, please see the revised manuscript; any changes we made were marked in yellow.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS:

(1) Science editor:

1 Conflict of interest statement: Academic Editor has no conflict of interest.

Response: Thank you for the positive decision on our manuscript.

2 Academic misconduct: No academic misconduct was found.

Response: Thank you for the positive decision on our manuscript.

3 Scientific quality: The author submitted a study of clinical significance of platelet mononuclear cell aggregates in patients with sepsis and acute respiratory distress syndrome. The manuscript is overall qualified.

Response: Thank you for the positive decision on our manuscript.

(1) Advantages and disadvantages: The reviewers have given positive peer-review reports for the manuscript. Classification: Grade B; Language Quality: Grade B. It was nicely written and analyzed study. Please mention few limitations of the study and recommendations too. Please mention separate conclusion section. Table 2 and 3 has different number of participants in study and control group than mentioned in methodology.

Response: Thank you for the positive decision on our manuscript, and we have revised the MS according to the comments from the reviewers. limitations of the study were added.

(2) *Main manuscript content: The author clearly stated the purpose of the study and the research structure is complete. However, the manuscript is still required a further revision according to the detailed comments listed below.*

(3) *Table(s) and figure(s): There are 2 Figures and 5 Table should be improved. Detailed suggestions for each are listed in the specific comments section.*

Response: Thank you for your comments. In the revised MS, we listed details for each of the figures and tables.

(4) *References: A total of 12 references are cited, including 5 published in the last 3 years. The reviewer didn't request the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself.*

Response: Yes, the reviewer didn't request us to cite any references published by him/herself.

4 *Language evaluation: The English-language grammatical presentation needs to be improved to a certain extent. There are many errors in grammar and format, throughout the entire manuscript. Before final acceptance, the authors must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>.*

Response: Thank you for your comments, the MS was revised again by a professional editing company, and English Language Certificate was added as attachment.

5 *Specific comments: (1) Please provide the Figures cited in the original manuscript in the form of PPT. All text can be edited, including A,B, arrows, etc. With respect to the reference to the Figure, please verify if it is an original image created for the manuscript, if not, please provide the source of the picture and the proof that the Figure has been authorized by the previous publisher or copyright owner to allow it to be redistributed. All legends are incorrectly formatted and require a general title and explanation for each figure. Such as Figure 1 title. A: ; B: ; C: .*

Response: Thank you for your comments, the original figures was provided in the form of PPT as attachment, and we formatted them correctly again according to the comments.

(2) *Please obtain permission for the use of picture(s). If an author of a submission is re-using a figure or figures published elsewhere, or that is copyrighted, the author must provide documentation that the previous publisher or copyright holder has given permission for the figure to be re-published, and correctly indicate the reference source and copyrights. For example, "Figure 1 Histopathological examination by hematoxylin-eosin staining (200 x). A: Control group; B: Model group; C: Pioglitazone hydrochloride group; D: Chinese herbal medicine group. Citation: Yang JM, Sun Y, Wang M, Zhang XL, Zhang SJ, Gao YS, Chen L, Wu MY, Zhou L, Zhou YM, Wang Y, Zheng FJ, Li YH. Regulatory effect of a Chinese herbal medicine formula on non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. World J Gastroenterol 2019; 25(34): 5105-5119. Copyright ©The Author(s) 2019. Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc[6]". And please cite the reference source in the references list. If the author fails to properly cite the published or copyrighted picture(s) or table(s) as described above, he/she will be subject to withdrawal of the article from BPG publications and may even be held liable.*

Response: All figures are original from the authors, and not published elsewhere.

(3) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text (and directly before the References).

Response: The “Article Highlights” section is added in the revised version.

(4) Please add the Core tip section. The number of words should be controlled between 50-100 words.

Response: The Core tip section is added in the revised version.

(5) Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. If there is no PMID or DOI, please provide the website address.

Response: PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers of references are added in the revised version.

6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: Thank you for the comments by the editor. According to the comments, we have prepared and uploaded all the required materials and carefully revised our manuscript following the steps provided by the editor.