

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for giving us the opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “**Acute gastrointestinal injury in critically ill patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan, China (Manuscript NO:57229, Name of journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology)**”. We appreciate our editor very much for your valuable and constructive comments on our manuscript! We are also pleased to know that our study is of general interest for the readers of **World Journal of Gastroenterology**. We have revised our manuscript in accordance with the reviewers’ comments, made point-by-point responses, and detailed the changes. All changes were highlighted with **red color** in the text so that they may be easily identified. Hope these will make it more acceptable for publication.

Thank you very much for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Qian-Kun Shi

Responses to Reviewers' comments

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I have not specific comment.

(file attachment):

It is a very interesting and well written review articles related to acute gastrointestinal injury in critically ill patients with coronavirus disease 2019 in Wuhan, China. AGI is a major clinical problem with high mortality and morbidity in critically ill patients. As the author point out, most of the critically ill patients had organ injury, ARDS, acute kidney injury cardiac injury, or liver dysfunction, however, only few literatures on acute gastrointestinal injury were reported in critically ill patients with COVID-19.

The text is written clearly and organized logically and the title is informative and appropriate. The abstract is informative providing the essence of the article clearly and concisely, There were references cited in-text and set out clearly in the References section. References are accurate and up-to-date, and they are written according to guidelines for authors. The article has important clinical message, and should be of great interest to the readers.

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's comments.

I have only minor comments.

The authors stated in the discussion that the high incidence of AGI indicated that SARS-CoV-2 was more virulent than SARS-CoV, but I am not sure where they came from that conclusion

There is no reference of paper that researched incidence of AGI in SARS-CoV, So, I kindly ask the authors to explain why they consider SARS-CoV to be more virulent than SARS-

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's comments. There is no reference of paper that researched incidence of AGI in SARS-CoV, therefore, we have modified the description to "This phenomenon indicated that SARS-CoV-2 was also very virulent to gastrointestinal tract".

One more question Is the study registered with an ICMJE-approved registry, such as ClinicalTrials.gov

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's comments. The study was reviewed and approved by the institutional review board of our hospital, whereas written informed consent was waived because this was a retrospective study. Therefore, the registry of this study in ClinicalTrials.gov was also waived.

Technical corrections:... Moreover, The numbers of patients – lowercase letter

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's suggestion. We have modified it.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I would like to applaud the authors effort in conduct the study and writing the manuscript. The study was interesting. Abstract was well summarized the results and content of manuscript. Case definitions followed as per guidelines. Appropriate statistical analysis was done and authors described results well. Tables and graphs are useful in understanding the results. In the discussion authors well described limitation such as sample size, single center study, No pathophysiology behind the results.

Responses: Thanks very much for the reviewer's comments. A language editing certificate issued by AJE was provided.

Responses to Editorial Office's comments

(1) Science Editor:

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes an observational study of the AGI and COVID-19. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade C and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The study was interesting. Abstract was well summarized the results and content of manuscript. Case definitions followed as per guidelines. Appropriate statistical analysis was done, and authors described results well. Tables and graphs are useful in understanding the results. In the discussion authors well described limitation such as sample size, single center study. No pathophysiology behind the results; and (3) Format: There are 4 tables and 3 figures. A total of 21 references are cited, including 12 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations.

2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A and Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by AJE was provided.

3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement, the Institutional Review Board Approval Form, the informed consent, and the STROBE checklist form. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. The authors have published preprint (<https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2020.03.25.20043570v1>).

4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China; and the Nanjing Medical Science and Technology Development Foundation. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG.

Responses: Thanks very much for the Science Editor's comments.

5 Issues raised: (1) I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (2) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. 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; (3) 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; and (4) I found the authors did not write the “article highlight” section. Please write the “article highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Responses: Thanks very much for the Science Editor’s comments. (1) We have uploaded the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document. (2) We have provided the original figure documents, and all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by editor. (3) We have added the PMID and DOI citation numbers in the references and listed all authors of the references. (4) We have added the “article highlight” section at the end of the main text.

6 Re-Review: Required.

7 Recommendation: Conditionally accepted.

Responses: Thanks very much for the Science Editor’s comments.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

Responses: Thanks very much for the Editorial Office Director’s comment.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Responses: Thanks very much for the Company Editor-in-Chief’s comments.

Thank you very much for your suggestive comments again!