

Point-by-point responses to the issues raised in the peer-review report

1. Some minor language polishing should be proofed and corrected.

Response: We have asked a native-English speaker from International Science Editing company to edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability. We hope the manuscript's language meet your direct publishing needs. We will E-mail the manuscript with traces of modification, which is convenient for you to review.

2. Why the patient was discharged from the hospital, as the patient's condition did not improved? What's the reason?

Response: This is a good question and we really should state the reason. In the latest version of the article, we add this content in the TREATMENT part. "Compared to her condition upon admission, the cardiac function grade, Borg dyspnea score, and APACHE II score were improved, although overall condition remained unsatisfactory. The patient asked to be discharged due to hospitalization expenses."

3. The authors did not provide original pictures. 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.

Response: We organized original figures into a single PowerPoint file, and submit as "60110-Figures.ppt" on the system. The figures were uploaded to the file destination of "Image File". At the same time, we provide decomposable Tables (whose parts are all movable and editable), organize them into a single Word file, and submit as "60110-Tables.docx" on the system. The tables were uploaded to the file destination of "Table File".