

Response to reviewer comments:

All journals should include a correspondence section

Nikolaos Papanas, Dimitri P Mikhailidis and Debabrata Mukherjee

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Authors who write the "letter to editor", should have at least one or two self citations which are related to the content of the main article. Self citation is a proof of knowing the topic of the main article in scientific sense.

Why have at least one or two self-citations? Can authors of letters not make comments based on the literature? In fact, they can comment using their own work, the literature or both. It is the Editor who decides if a letter is relevant enough to be published, whether it has or does not have self-citations.

We politely remind everyone that the authors are also experienced editors, peer reviewers and authors (see below and response to reviewer 2). This includes dealing with letters.

Conflicts of interest and Editorial Experience

Debabrata Mukherjee has no conflict of interest related to this article. He is Editor of *Angiology*, Associate Editor of *Cardiovascular & Hematological Disorders-Drug Targets*, Regional Editor for *Current Vascular Pharmacology*, Section Editor for *Current Cardiology Reports* and Co-Section Editor for *Current Opinion in Cardiology*. Nikolaos Papanas has no conflict of interest related to this article. He is Editor-in-Chief of *The International Journal of Lower Extremity Wounds*, Associate Editor of *Experimental and Clinical Endocrinology and Diabetes* and *The Review of Diabetic Studies* and Section Editor (diabetes) of *The Open Cardiovascular Medicine Journal*. Dimitri P Mikhailidis has no conflict of interest related to this article. He is Editor-in-Chief of *Angiology*, *Current Vascular Pharmacology*, *Journal of Drug Assessment*, *Expert Opinion on Pharmacotherapy*, *Current Medical Research and Opinion* (until end 2022) and *Expert Review of Cardiovascular Therapy*. He is Co-Editor-in-

Chief of *The Open Cardiovascular Medicine Journal*, Co-Section Editor of *Current Opinion in Cardiology*, and Associate Editor of *Lipids in Health and Disease* and *Hormones*.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a good article on the importance of LTEs.

We thank this reviewer for stating that this is a “good article”.

1. Abstract: the beginning could be more rounded off. Delete "We believe that",

Done. The whole sentence was revised.

With all due respect, we would like to point out that:

1] The authors together have about 2,000 entries on PubMed.

2] One of the authors has had an exclusively English education and his native language is English.

3] One of the authors is listed among the top 1% authors for the past 4 years. Hopefully, in November it will be 5 years.

4] Style varies between authors. In this context, there is a need for flexibility from the peer reviewer. As editors ourselves, we apply that on a regular basis. In this case, “We believe” is not in the context of “so, the readers must also believe”; it is expressing an opinion from experienced authors/editors that may not necessarily be shared by all readers. Nevertheless, we removed that because we will follow this reviewer’s opinion regarding not being too assertive.

2. Including in the abstract, the text throughout would be better as coming across as "suggestive" as opposed to "assertive" by using words such as "should" " must". Afterall, these are scientific opinions for readers to consider.

Done. The only “must” left is “Editors must not suppress valid criticism of a publication....”. We hope that this reviewer does not disagree with that!

The word “should” is no longer present within the text.

3. Please revise the 4th bullet point for clarity- it seems "not" is missing in "Thus, citations of LETTERS may NOT prove helpful for THE journals"

We edited this bullet point to make it clearer.

4. AS the LTE's are definitely NOT considered for the calculation of JIF, please delete this line - " Moreover, they may be published in the same year as the article they are referring to, so they may not contribute to the journal's impact factor."

We understand that letters do not count as items, but their citations, within the appropriate time period used to calculate the impact factor, do count.

5. Please revise the following segment for clarity and correctness- Indeed, full papers take longer to be published and processed. This may even take several months and it is possible that during that time more recent and relevant findings become available. For the journals, a potential advantage is a relatively high citation rate. (also see point 4 above for the last sentence).

Revised

6. Please delete this line and it is out of place for this article and is thoroughly avoidable - One of us has resigned as Associate Editor from two journals, because they would not introduce a correspondence section on the grounds that it would require too much editorial work.

We completely disagree. This wording shows that the authors are prepared to act on what they advise. If the editor wants to remove that sentence, we will not object.

7. Once again, I am not sure why this otherwise reasonable manuscript is so full of assertions which could neither be verified nor be agreed with -"One of us has recently experienced a 5-month delay regarding a decision on a 300-word letter. In our opinion, this represents completely unacceptable standards by the editorial staff of this journal"

We completely disagree. This a practical example of how things can go unacceptably wrong. However, we added that this is probably a very rare event. Despite our extensive experience, it is indeed difficult to believe that this actually happened! If the editor wants to remove that sentence, we will not object.

8. Once again, best to stick to statements which are scientific and educational for the readers and avoid claims such as _ Again this has happened to us, although the definition of "valid comments" is based on our knowledge/views. Nevertheless, in our opinion they were quite obvious.

This is an example of personal experience and we clearly express the limitations of that statement. It is a warning to editors not to suppress criticism of published material. If the editor wants to remove that sentence, we will not object.

9. Overall, this manuscript is rather poorly written and deviates from the objectives though content may be good.

We leave the Editor to be the judge of that. Nevertheless, we agree that the article has improved based on the comments made by this reviewer.

10. A thorough revision taking particular care to weed out redundant statements, unwanted assertiveness and a focus to the objective of the manuscript would help. As opposed to 1000+ words, 800 or so would still be as effective!

We edited the text and kept within the limits set by the Editor.

11. Finally, it is OK to base one's suggestions of personal experience but when the readers have no recourse to verify the facts, the whole thing becomes unscientific. This can be overcome by stating in a more diplomatic and well thought out manner.

We edited the text to make it less assertive. There is some evidence which is cited, but in the absence of extensive literature, opinions/suggestions from experienced editors are the next best thing. We feel that we have given food for thought to editors and authors. It is likely that authors and editors have not devoted enough attention to the topic we discuss. We hope that this article will make them reconsider. In the end, they can do as they please.

Comments from the Editors

(1) Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

We thank this editor for stating that the text is ready for first decision.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted.

We thank the editor-in-chief for stating that the text 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. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure (medical imaging) to the manuscript. There are no restrictions on the figures (color, B/W). Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the Reference Citation Analysis (RCA). RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: [https:// www.referencecitationanalysis.com/](https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/).

This is not a usual scientific article and therefore it deserves a bit more flexibility. For example, we do not think that a table or figure is suitable.

We searched the 129 articles in the RCA under the key word “correspondence” and 153 articles in the RCA under the key word “letter”.