

**Yu Hui Won** *.M.D., Ph.D.*  
Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation  
Jeonbuk National University  
20 Geonjiro, Deokjin-gu, Jeonju, 54907, South Korea  
E-mail: wonyh@jbnu.ac.kr  
Phone: 82-63-250-2781; Fax: 82-63-254-4145  
August 04, 2021

Re: Manuscript No.69043 **Disruption of sensation-dependent bladder emptying due to bladder overdistension in a complete spinal cord injury: A case report**

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your constructive comments and the effort devoted to the review of our research. The manuscript has been rechecked, and the necessary changes have been made in accordance with the reviewers' comments. We did our best to give clear and precise answers to comments. We believe that the manuscript has further improved after the revision.

We thank you for your consideration and look forward to hearing from you.

**Reviewer #05533296**

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Comments and Suggestions for Authors**

#1. The authors report 2 cases of respiratory complications due to a syndrome associated with sleep apnea. "Respiratory failure after scoliosis correction surgery in patients with Prader-Willi syndrome

- *Response*: Thanks for the review on our manucrypt. We did our best to improve the manuscript. We respectfully expect you to be satisfied.

**Reviewer #05429326**

<b>Scientific quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
<b>Language quality</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
<b>Conclusion</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
<b>Re-review</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
<b>Peer-reviewer statements</b>	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Comments and Suggestions for Authors**

#1. The article, especially the part of abstract, should keep to the point more clearly and more accurately.

- *Response*: Thank you so much for your insightful and detailed review. We agree with you and have incorporated this suggestion throughout our paper. Most of the abstract section has been rewritten, and the case presentation section has been partially modified to clarify. Some content was added to the discussion section to clarify the focus of the argument, and it was delivered concisely through the conclusion section. We have answered in detail through the response below.

#2. In the background part, you ought to mainly talk about the previous causes and evaluation methods about respiratory failure in PWS.

- *Response:* Thank you for your suggestion. We have described the cause of respiratory failure by reflecting your comments (Line 35-38). In addition, a description of the widely used respiratory function measurement method has been added (Line 38-39). We also briefly reviewed the causes of PWS in the Introduction section (Line 82-89). Regarding the types of measurement methods, patient effort-based test and patient non-effort-based respiratory tests were introduced separately to clarify the focus of the purpose of this case report by specifying the characteristics of each method (Line 96-116).

(1)L30: “affects hypoventilation” may be corrected to “affects ventilation” or “causes hypoventilation”.

- *Response:* Thank you for your detailed review. We have revised it to “leading to hypoventilation” based on your opinion (Line 37).

(2)Do you mean the previous evaluation methods did not consider the cognitive decline in PWS? Show it.

- *Response:* Thank you for your thoughtful comment. For the respiratory evaluation of scoliosis in children, both patient effort-based tests and patient non effort-based tests can be used. We have described that the commonly used method is relatively easy “patient effort-based tests” (Line 96-99). In patient effort-based tests, special additional considerations (such as multiple trials) are required for patients with reduced condition and non-obedience with reference<sup>[10]</sup> (Line 100). We also added that “patient non-effort-based tests” are not often used, because there is no established evidence-based guideline and the tests are easy to perform (Line 113-116).

(3)L32-35: the sentence is not appropriate here.

- *Response*: Thanks for pointing out. The text has been moved to conclusion (Line 57-58).

#3.In the case summary part, you'd better delete some unimportant or repetitive information, such as ages, angles, and so on.

- *Response*: We agree with your comments. The information has been deleted or reduced. There was a correction of the overall case summury (Line 45-54).

(1)L38-40: you may delete some words and correct it to "Both of them underwent scoliosis correction surgery."

- *Response*: We edit the text as you mentioned (Line 46-47).

(2)L40-42: the sentence could be "No respiratory symptoms occurred and arterial blood tests showed no abnormalities before and immediately after surgery."

- *Response*: Thank you for detailed comment. We have revised the text to reflect your comment (line47-48).

(3)L44-45: Delete the sentence "Both subjects had cognitive impairments", because it was repetitive.

- *Response*: Thank you, we checked the repetition of the phrase and deleted it as you commented.

(4)L46-47: The part of "corrected by nighttime noninvasive ventilation (NIV) application with the diagnoses of " was deleted and corrected to "were diagnosed with".

- *Response*: The text has been revised as you commented, and the context has been modified to be smoother. (Line 51-52)

(5)Do you think that hypoventilation and respiratory failure are caused by correction surgery? Or by PWS itself? Or not sure by now? You'd better clearly express your

opinions.

- *Response*: You have raised an important comment. We clearly believe that scoliosis correction surgery contributes to respiratory failure, but there are other contributing factors too, so we could not be sure. We presented our opinion through a paragraph in the discussion section. (Line 363-368)

#4. In conclusion part, the sentence could not clearly and completely express your opinion. Try as this one: "It is necessary to pay more attention to respiratory function, even after surgery, consider the "objective" evaluation, and give NIV support in these PWS patients.

- *Response*: Thanks for the detailed review. We have revised it to reflect your comment (Line 57-58)

#5.L325: "However" may be correct to "Moreover"

- *Response*: We made contextual corrections as you mentioned. (line 351)

#6.L342-347: The sentence could be more concise and stronger to show your opinion.

- *Response*: Thank you for your suggestion. The opinion we wanted to emphasize was expressed more clearly (Line 373-377). Concise and clear opinions were also conveyed in the conclusion section (Line 382 -386).

#7. There seem to be too many "however" in your article.

- *Response*: Thank you for pointing out. In consideration of your comments, the entire manuscript context has been reviewed and modified as much as possible.

#8. The reasons of scoliosis surgery leading to respiratory failure are well described in the discussion part.

- *Response*: Thank you.