

Reviewers' answer #64669

Title: Blue LED as a new treatment to vaginal stenosis due pelvic radiotherapy  
Case Report

Manuscript #64669

Title: Blue LED as a new treatment to vaginal stenosis due pelvic radiotherapy  
Case Report

Thank you for the opportunity of reviewing the manuscript, submitted to your journal. We carry out the modifications suggested to improve our manuscript and resubmit the revised version of the document in accordance with the reviewers' comments.

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers. Thank you for your suggestions and we hope that this new version meets the quality requirements needed to publication in your journal.

Grateful for the attention,

**Reviewer #1:** Specific Comments to Authors: The authors mentioned improvement in all areas of the examiner's criteria. However, the manuscript should be clear about which parameters improved. Where there significant improvement in function after therapy comparing both patients? Are these changes clinically significant? Please base your discussion around these points above.

Author's response

Thank you for your comments; we believe that they helped us to improve the manuscript. According to his suggestions and those of the reviewers, several changes were introduced in the discussion of the manuscript. And information about which parameters improved

**# Science editor:**

Comment

1. "1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the blue LED as a new treatment to vaginal stenosis due pelvic radiotherapy. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors mentioned improvement in all areas of the examiner's criteria. However, the manuscript should be clear about which parameters improved. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There is 1 table and 2 figures; (4) References: A total of 19 references are cited, including 3 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There is 1 self-cited reference. The self-referencing rates should be

less than 10%. Please keep the reasonable self-citations (i.e. those that are most closely related to the topic of the manuscript) and remove all other improper self-citations. If the authors fail to address the critical issue of self-citation, the editing process of this manuscript will be terminated; and (6) References recommendations: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by the peer reviewer(s), especially references published by the peer reviewer(s) him/herself (themselves). If the authors find the peer reviewer(s) request for the authors to cite improper references published by him/herself (themselves), please send the peer reviewer's ID number to [editorialoffice@wignet.com](mailto:editorialoffice@wignet.com). The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by Editage was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the written informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. 5 Issues raised: (1) 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; (2) PMID and DOI numbers are missing 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 (3) The "Case Presentation" section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the "Case Presentation" section, and add the "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance."

#### Author's response

Thank you for your comment. We reduced and corrected our references and removed a self-quote.

We put the images in auto quality and in the power point.

We add the available PMID and DOI numbers. Some numbers are not available.

We rewrote the "Case presentation" section and add the "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT" and "RESULTS AND MONITORING" sections to the main text,

Thank you for the considerations.