

Dear Editor:

Re: 72757 Revision submission

We are submitting our revised manuscript entitled “**A nomogram to predict postoperative complications in elderly with total hip replacement**” for publication consideration in World Journal of Clinical Cases

We have carefully addressed reviewers’ comments. We believe that the quality of the paper has now been significantly improved thanks to the reviewers’ careful and insightful comments. Point-to-point response to reviewer comment is provided and major changes/additions are highlighted in blue in the revised manuscript.

Once again, thank you for your careful evaluation of our work.

Sincerely,

Liangqing Zhang, MD, PhD

Enclosure: Point to point response to reviewer comments

Reviewer #1:

• **General comments:** Dear author(s), first of all I would like to say thanks because of the good manuscript you did submit. Here is my result as your reviewer: The title reflects the main subject of your manuscript. On the first after reading the title I expected a graph with a lot of statistical numbers in meaning of a picture in your manuscript but the tables and figures are also quite good. The abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript. Key words reflect the focus of the manuscript. The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study, but let me say that the background could be more explained to make clear, why it is important to occupy with your topic. Methods (patients, research methods, statistical analysis) are also described very shortly, but they are explained enough to know what you did. Results are described in tables which are shown in an appropriate way. The manuscript interprets the findings adequately and appropriately, clearly and logically. Findings are relevant to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner. The discussion is accurate and discusses the paper’s scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice sufficiently. Figures and tables are sufficient, in good quality with appropriate legends. The biostatistic meets the requirements of biostatistics. References are cited appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections. Citations are used in an appropriate way. The quality of manuscript organization and presentation is well, concisely and coherently organized and presented. Style, language and grammar are accurate and appropriate. Author(s) have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type of a prospective study. The manuscript meets the requirements of ethics, it was approved by the Ethics Committee of an affiliated Hospital of

Guadong Medical University committee.

Response: Thank the reviewer for the overall very positive and encouraging comments about our research.

Reviewer #2:

1. This paper is well-written, but is not acceptable as a case series. Another journal (e.g., World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery) is suitable for publication.

Response: Thank you for this suggestions. But we decided to publish the manuscripts in World Journal of Clinical Cases if it is acceptable for publication.

2. The follow-up term should be shown, because the follow-up term is short.

Response: Thank you for this recommendation. The nomogram we created is for in-hospital patients. We agree with the reviewer that it would be perfect that additional follow-up. We will consider lengthened the follow-up term in the future experiments.

3. The abbreviation for THA is missing.

Response: Thank you for the reminder. The abbreviation is changed and highlighted in blue in the revised manuscript.