

November 9, 2020

To:

Professor Simone Ferrero, MD, PhD,
Editor-in-Chief, *World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*
Associate Professor, DINOEMI, University of Genoa,
Genova 16132, Italy
E-mail: simone.ferrero@unige.it

Dear Dr. Ferrero:

Thank you very much for sending us the results of the review on our manuscript entitled “*Myasthenia Gravis and Pregnancy*” (Manuscript NO.: 56999, Review). We would like to thank the reviewers for the time and effort that they spent on our manuscript. We certainly believe that the comments and suggestions have significantly improved its quality. Attached, please find the revised version of the manuscript. Below we have explained the way that we have dealt with the editor and reviewers’ comments and suggestions. We hope that you find this revised version acceptable for publication in *World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*.

We accept the responsibility for ensuring that the submitted manuscript has the approval of all the co-authors. Moreover, we certify that this manuscript is original, has not yet been published and is not under consideration for publication elsewhere. All authors have made a significant intellectual contribution to conception and design or analysis and interpretation of data, drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and final approval of the version to be submitted. No conflict of interest exists in relation to the submitted manuscript. This work did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Thank you very much for your kind considerations.

Sincerely,



Mehdi Ghasemi, M.D.

Assistant Professor of Neurology

Dear Dr. Ghasemi,

We are pleased to inform you that, after preview by the Editorial Office and peer review, as well as CrossCheck and Google plagiarism detection, we believe that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of your manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 56999, Review) basically meet the publishing requirements of the World Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology. As such, we have made the preliminary decision that it is acceptable for publication after your appropriate revision. Upon our receipt of your revised manuscript, we will send it for re-review. We will then make a final decision on whether to accept the manuscript or not, based on the reviewers' comments, the quality of the revised manuscript, and the relevant documents. Please follow the steps outlined below to revise your manuscript to meet the requirements for final acceptance and publication.

1 MANUSCRIPT REVISION DEADLINE

We request that you submit your revision in no more than **14 days**. **Please note that you have only two chances for revising the manuscript.**

2 PLEASE SELECT TO REVISE THIS MANUSCRIPT OR NOT

Please login to the F6Publishing system at <https://www.f6publishing.com> by entering your registered E-mail and password. After clicking on the "Author Login" button, please click on "Manuscripts Needing Revision" under the "Revisions" heading to find your manuscript that needs revision. Clicking on the "Handle" button allows you to choose to revise this manuscript or not. If you choose not to revise your manuscript, please click on the "Decline" button, and the manuscript will be WITHDRAWN.

3 SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

Please resolve all issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report and make a point-by-point response to the issues raised in the peer review report. Authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the peer-review report(s) and make point-by-point responses to the issues raised in the peer-review report(s), which are listed below:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The review provides a reasonable summary of the relationship between myasthenia gravis and pregnancy. Obviously, the authors already did an excellent work, but still have some problems in detail which I have to propose. Which confuse me a lot is that in the part of "MG DEVELOPMENT IN PREGNANCY", most of the content is about "the diagnosis of MG". Maybe more words associated with the development of MG during pregnancy will be benefit. Otherwise, the part of "MG DEVELOPMENT IN PREGNANCY" and "EFFECTS OF PREGNANCY ON MG" seem can be merged, because of their common direction of discussion. In addition, too many papers were cited to clarify a same opinion, which may make readers can't get enough and reliable information from this manuscript. The last one problem I want to mention is that the part of "CONCLUSION" is a little bit thin. The most important content of a review- the author's personal summary and outlook is missing. Hope the authors can revise their manuscript better and look forward to seeing their work published.

Response: *We thank the reviewer for his/her positive feedback on the manuscript.*

- *As the reviewer recommended, we combined both "MG DEVELOPMENT IN PREGNANCY" and "EFFECTS OF PREGNANCY ON MG" in one section to be easier for readers; the new section is named "MG AND PREGNANCY" on page 4.*
- *We also decreased the number of references throughout the manuscript and kept the most appropriate references that were relevant to the context.*

- *As the reviewer recommended, we expanded the "CONCLUSION" section and added our summary and outlook on page 8 and 9.*

4 LANGUAGE QUALITY

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Response: *The manuscript was thoroughly checked for any grammatical errors or typos. We are glad that the language evaluation classification had Grade A for our paper, as mentioned in 5 Editorial Office's Comments on section editor (1).*

5 EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a review of the myasthenia gravis and pregnancy. The topic is within the scope of the WJOG. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The review provides a reasonable summary of the relationship between myasthenia gravis and pregnancy. The authors already did an excellent work. However, the conclusion is a little bit thin, the authors should add their personal summary and outlook. The questions raised by the reviewer should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 tables. A total of 62 references are cited, including 4 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJOG. 5 Issues raised: The column should be the minireviews. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: *We are glad that the editorial office's view on the manuscript has been overall satisfying. As the reviewer and also the editor recommended, we expanded the CONCLUSION section and also added our summary and outlook in this section on page 8 and 9. We also revised the number of references and updated the references and citation with more recent and relevant published articles. Accordingly, at least 24 references have been published since 2017.*

(2) Editorial office director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

Response: *We are glad that the editorial office's view on the manuscript has been overall satisfying.*

(3) 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, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, authors need to correct the issues raised by the editor to meet the publishing requirements.

Response: *We are glad that the editorial office's view on the manuscript has been overall satisfying.*