

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for your careful review and constructive suggestions with regard to our manuscript "Persistent fibrinogen deficiency after snake bite: a case report and literature review" (NO: 69695). We have read the comments carefully and made revisions accordingly. Revised parts are marked in red in revisions. The responses to the reviewer's comments are as follows:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: First, this finding is quite significant, but you should explain the reason why the persistent fibrinogen deficiency is happened in this patient.

Response: We have made revisions in discussion according to the Reviewer's comments.

SVSPs commonly exhibit thrombin-like fibrinolytic functional activity. However, unlike thrombin, SVSPs are highly selective, acting directly on the α -chain of FBG and promoting polymerization of the resulting fibrin monomers [7]. The polymerization products are unstable and easily soluble by plasmin. Therefore, SVSPs only consume FBG and do not activate the coagulation pathway, leading to FBG deficiency only and a less severe type of VICC, in which other coagulation factors are generally unaffected.

Given that our patient's coagulation factors and platelet counts were normal, we believe that he had the type of coagulation dysfunction that is mediated via the above-mentioned SVSPs pathway. This type of dysfunction is characterized by FBG deficiency without abnormal coagulation factor activity. Thus, SVSPs were likely the main active components of the snake venom and responsible for the subsequent development of VICC. Our patient's persistent afibrinogenemia may have been attributable to deposition into and subsequent slow release of some active components of snake venom from his hand, resulting in long-term toxicity. The specific mechanism of underlying persistent afibrinogenemia requires further elucidation.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: I think this is a particular and interesting case, non-substantial changes are required.

Response: Thank you very much for your comments!