

## ROUND 1

### Response to reviewers

First of all, I express my deep thanks to the reviewers who they well assessed the manuscript. The notes which were raised during the reviewing process enrich the article concerning the scientific and language issues. I took all the raising comments into consideration in the revised manuscript. I highlighted the required changes in a yellow color. I hope the changes made in the revised form are satisfactory for the reviewers and the study will be accepted for publication in the esteemed journal "World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology".

Best regards

Professor Dr. Raid M. Al-Ani

### Reviewer #1

I request that the author(s) work on the following changes to the paper:

1- The title of the article should be changed to more accurately reflect its purpose.

I changed the title according to the suggestion of the second reviewer as "Wet cupping (Al-hijamah) as a strange cause of ear trauma: A case report"

2- The abstract section of the study is not written in the standard way; please revise and correct this section completely.

Actually, we wrote the abstract according to the journal style into 3 components (background, case summary, and conclusion).

3- The second paragraph of the study's Introduction section should be devoted to highlighting the current research topic's knowledge gap, as well as evidence of the importance of the case report for which this paper was designed.

I made the required change.

4- What is the current's research problem that author(s) are attempting to solve? This question should be addressed in the final paragraph of the current study's introduction section.

I made the required change.

5- I noticed that the case presentation section has a lot of subheadings. I hope the author(s) will work on removing these subheadings and writing the case presentation section more coherently so that the link between the information within these subheadings occurs automatically and logically.

Yes sir, you are right. However, I cannot perform this task because I prepared the case presentation according to the style of the journal with many subheadings.

6- In the discussion section, I couldn't find an answer to my question about the current study's strengths and weaknesses. I hope the author(s) will work on including a text containing an answer to this question in the final paragraph of the discussion section, as well as highlighting the current case report's future directions.

I made the required change.

7- Rephrasing the conclusion in a more concise manner is a positive step that should be pursued.

Thank you for this outstanding comment. I made the required change as "The direct application of cupping therapy on the external meatus results in bleeding from the ear canal and haemotympanum as well as there was no improvement of the patients' hearing loss. Therefore, we do not recommend using Al-hijamah directly on the ear.".

8- There are references in the study that are now more than five years old and need to be updated to reflect the most recent findings.

Actually, 8 out of the 11 references are belong to the last five years and the other 3 references are highly relevant to the topic. I think the used references are satisfactory to support the study.

9- Figures 1 and 2 each include a text box on the bottom right detailing the interests of a third party. Naturally, this makes me wonder if the authors of the current study own these two photos or if they were provided by a third party. Expound if I'm wrong. If there are any third-party ownership rights, do the author(s) have a letter waiving those rights?

I am the owner of these two figures. I am sorry for any inconvenience. I prepare the two figures according to the journal style. I hope to understand me.

//--Good Luck //--

Thank you.

## **Reviewer #2**

The current manuscript described a young patient with a history of wet cupping for treatment of hearing loss and tinnitus, causing traumatic injury to the external auditory canal, tympanic membrane, and middle ear. This is the first case report of direct wet cupping on the ear canal. The manuscript is well-written,

Thank you for your support.

but there are still some concerns: - Title: I recommend changing the title to: “Wet cupping (Al-hijamah) as a strange cause of ear trauma: A case report”

I changed the title.

- Abstract: the conclusion of the abstract should be summarized (it is 33 words instead of 20 words)

I think 33 words are not too much to conclude the main findings of the case report.

- Core Tips: o needs grammatical edit o It is more than 100 words

I fixed the grammatical mistakes. I reduced the Core Tip to 97 words.

– Introduction: the strategy of the literature review and search terms are missing

I made the required change.

- Case presentation: o History of present illness: please explain the patient's symptoms: what do you mean by sudden hearing loss? How long does it take to establish? What were the features of tinnitus (pulsatile or non-pulsatile, ..)? Does he suffer from aural fullness? Vertigo? Otorrhea? o Do the symptoms deteriorate after Al-hijamah? Does the patient experience otorrhagia? o Was there any bruising on the auricle or post-auricular region?

I made the required change.

o Audiological tests: Please describe the features of hearing loss, such as the air-bone gap.

I described the features of hearing loss.

Please add the image of the tympanogram and some features like external canal volume.

I added the image of the tympanogram (Figure 3).

o It is better to use “hearing loss” instead of deafness

Thank you, you are right. I changed the deafness to hearing loss.

o The diagnosis of the present illness of the patient was the traumatic external and middle ear injury added to a secretory otitis media, in my opinion

I disagree with you because the main problem was secretory otitis media and the resulting events due to application of wet cupping over the external meatus.

o Treatment: please name the decongestants used, dosage, and duration

I added the required things.

- Discussion: Please add the limitations of the study

I added the limitation of the study.

- The patient's consent discloses the patient's identifiers (name)

Yes, this for the journal not for publication.

## **ROUND 2**

Response to reviewers

First of all, I express my deep thanks to the reviewers who they well assessed the manuscript. The notes which were raised during the reviewing process enrich the article concerning the scientific and language issues. I took all the raising comments into consideration in the revised manuscript. I highlighted the required changes in a yellow color. I hope the changes made in the revised form are satisfactory for the reviewers and the study will be accepted for publication in the esteemed journal "World Journal of Otorhinolaryngology".

Best regards

Professor Dr. Raid M. Al-Ani

### **Reviewer #1**

I'd like to draw your attention to the following: Yes, I found a file titled [82948-Answering-Reviewers-revision.docx] that answers the reviewers' directives for the research team in the paper, but the other file titled [82948\_Auto\_Edited.docx] doesn't explain what was done. I hope the author(s) would highlight the paper's revisions in "yellow color" or "add comments" on the Word file [82948\_Auto\_Edited.docx] to make follow-up easier to follow up on actually added edits. //Good Luck//

Thank you for emailing me this paper again to ensure that the author(s) made the necessary changes to the paper.

After evaluating the work, I am glad to give you my final approval, hoping that this paper will be accepted for publication without further changes, as the researcher/researchers committed to making all of the changes that I suggested.

I am sorry for this mistake. This mistake is due to a technical problem. I corrected my fault and I highlighted the changes with yellow color.

### **Reviewer #2**

I would like to thank the author for performing the revision.

Thank you so much.

Any changes in the main manuscript should be highlighted, but the author did not highlight them in the text,

Please, see my comment to the Reviewer 1.

unfortunately. There are still some issues left: - There are still some grammatical errors in the Core tip, such as: “27-years-old”, “...who treated ...”, etc.

I corrected the grammatical mistakes.

- The word “deafness” was used to mention the patient’s conductive hearing loss, several times in the text (abstract, core tip, introduction, case presentation, and figure’s caption), which is not correct. Based on the WHO classification (<https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/deafness-and-hearing-loss>), deafness is used for severe to profound hearing loss, which is not relevant to the hearing loss of the mentioned patient.

Thank you for your outstanding point. I replaced the word "deafness" with "hearing loss" through the whole manuscript

- Based on the journal’s guidelines, the introduction of the case reports should include the strategy of the literature review and search terms. Which I could not find it in the text, again.

This is a case report study not a review or original article. The introduction section of the case report should be concise with two components (descriptive and challenging parts) according to the care check list 2016.

- In the “Audiological tests” segment: use “gap” instead of “gab”

I am sorry for this mistake. I corrected it.

- Still, I could not find the limitations of the study in the discussion

Actually, this is a case report and I didn’t find any limitation to the study.