

Response to reviewers comments

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The case report is well written and, in my opinion, it reports a really rare complication during PDT with Blurhino technique, never seen in my career. The complication was promptly detected, well described, and solved in safety thanks to continuous endoscopic vision.

We are extremely grateful for the time and effort taken by the respective reviewers to review our work, we appreciate the comments given by the reviewer.

The Fig.1 (bronchoscopic view) is not so clear.

Thank you for this comment. We have obtained a better image, from the hard disk of the bronchoscope monitor, however the bronchoscope we used is disposable one - "Ambu" and unfortunately, the quality is not as good as the conventional bronchoscopes

The Fig.2 is adequate. (little suggestion: Would it be possible to enlarge the tip of the endotracheal tube without losing image quality?)

This is a valid suggestion, thank you. We have enlarged the tip of the endotracheal tube to improve the understanding of the problem, as per your suggestion, We have also made sure that the whole guide wire is included within the same image, for the reader to understand that it went through the tip of the needle and not through the curved part

In the article I did not find hypotheses by the authors about possible causes of this problem. Perforation of endotracheal tube during tracheal needle insertion? (in the first step of the procedure?) I would focus on this aspect and on the methods to prevent this type of complication.

We totally agree and we have added this to the abstract, it is mentioned in the methodology as well and finally in the conclusions also.

Finally, I'm wondering: number of references can be reduced?

We have tried to keep the references to the relevant minimum so as to make the introduction and discussion adequate and sensible. We believe acceptable as per BPG guidelines for case reports

Step 6: Editorial Office's comments

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

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the bronchoscopic guided percutaneous tracheostomy. The topic is within the scope of the WJA. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The case report is well-written, it reports a really rare complication during PDT with Blurhino technique. The complication was promptly detected, well described, and solved in safety thanks to continuous endoscopic vision. However, there are some issues should be addressed. The Figure 1 is not so clear. In the article we did not find hypotheses by the authors about possible causes of this problem. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 2 figures. A total of 9 references are cited, including 1 reference published in the last 3 years. There is 1 self-citation. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. The authors need to provide the written informed consent and fill out the CARE checklist form with page numbers. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study is without financial support. The topic has not previously been published in the WJA. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG. This manuscript is the resubmission of Manuscript No. 54932 (Rejected). 5 Issues raised: (1) Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor;

Thank you for your effort and valuable comments . We have prepared the graphs in PowerPoint as advised, we have also improved the quality of the figures as per reviewers' suggestions

(2) I found the authors did not add the PMID and DOI in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout;

Noted and added accordingly

and (3) I found the "Case Presentation" did not meet our requirements. Please re-write the "Case Presentation" section, and add "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" section to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

These changes were added to the case description

Diagnosis: The case was diagnosed as wire entrapment in the ETT after accidental trocar puncturing.

Treatment: After careful bronchoscopic inspection, the best options was to withdraw the ETT from the mouth which pulled the wire out consequently.

Outcome: The procedure ended smoothly, with the patient in a stable condition, without any procedure related complications

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. The authors need to revise the manuscript according to the guideline of "Case Report".

(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.