

August 29, 2020

Dear editor,

Please find attached files of revised manuscript in word format

Title: Preliminary analysis of the effect of vagus nerve stimulation in the treatment of children with intractable epilepsy

Author: Tie Fang¹, ZiHang Xie², TingHong Liu³, Jie Deng⁴, Shuai Chen⁵, Feng Chen⁶, LiLi Zheng⁷

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 56656

First of all, thank you for your careful guidance of this article. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer:

Reviewer: 05266804

Epilepsy is a chronic neurological disease. Implant vagus nerve stimulation (IVNS) is considered as an adjunctive treatment for intractable epilepsy where patients are not suitable for resective surgery. The authors provided a preliminary analysis of the safety and efficacy of IVNS in the treatment of refractory epilepsy in children. And finally concluded that Vagus nerve stimulation is safe and effective in children intractable epilepsy, and the seizure reduction occurs in a time-dependent manner. The manuscript is well written and very interesting. Authors adequately described the background, presented status and significance of the study. I have a minor suggestion, the results section should not only be described in the Tables, but need to describe all the results in detail.

Reviewer: 01131586

This study aimed to identify the safety and efficacy of vagus nerve stimulation in children intractable epilepsy, and analyze the effects on different epilepsy syndromes. This is an interesting study; however, I have the following questions and comments: (1) As you mentioned in the section of the materials and methods "The X2 test was used to compare the rates between different groups. $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant." However, the results are relatively simple and there is no statistical result. (2) As you mentioned in

the section of discussion, The results of this study are basically consistent with literature reports. So what are the innovations of your articles? Please explain in details. (3) Please add the necessary description for each figure and table to make it easier to understand.

Thank you for your advice.

After receiving the comments, we read the article carefully and found some small loopholes in the language of the article and made modifications. We did statistical analysis on some data. Added new innovation points in the article. And we have added some explanatory text to the chart.

According to the suggestion, we changed the relevant description.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the World Journal of Clinical Cases.

Sincerely Yours,

Tie Fang