Answering Reviewers

Reviewer 1

This is an interesting study of random forest model for hypotension prediction after induction of anesthesia in cardiac surgery. The prediction model based on random forest has been applied in many fields of clinical medicine. However, few studies have applied Random Forest to predict postinduction hypotension in patients who underwent cardiac surgery. In this study, Random Forest algorithm was used as a powerful tool to learn feature representations to establish a prediction model for postinduction hypotension in patients who underwent cardiac surgery. This study is overall well designed and the results are very interesting. Data in tables are good, and the figures are informative. After a minor revision, it can be accepted for publication. Comments: 1. The manuscript requires a minor editing for both the language and format. 2. x ± s in the statistical analysis should be changed to mean ± SD. 3. The bars in figures should be changed to other color from red.

Reply: *Thanks for your constructive suggestion, and we have revised the manuscript according to your comments.*

1. The language has been edited by MJ Language Editing Services.

2. We have corrected the "x ± s" as "mean ± SD".

3. The color of Figure 4 has been changed to grey.

Science Editor

1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a Retrospective Study of the random forest model for hypotension prediction after induction of anesthesia in cardiac surgery. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2)

Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This is an interesting study of random forest model for hypotension prediction after induction of anesthesia in cardiac surgery. This study is overall well designed and the results are very interesting. Data in tables are good, and the figures are informative. The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; (3) Format: There are 1 table and 4 figures; (4) References: A total of 27 references are cited, including 13 references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references; 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@wjgnet.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 YHYSCI was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. Written informed consent was waived. 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 "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text; And (2) 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. 6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Reply: *Thanks for your constructive suggestion, and we have revised the manuscript according to the comments.*

1. The "Article Highlights" has been added after the section of "CONCLUSION".

2. The original figure documents have been put in PowerPoint.

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 Clinical Cases, 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.

Reply: *Thank you for your positive comments.*