

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for your letter of Dec 13, 2022 regarding our manuscript entitled *Heterotopic Pregnancy after Assisted Reproductive Techniques with Favorable Outcome of the Intrauterine Pregnancy: A Case Report* (Manuscript NO: 80805), which was submitted to ***World Journal of Clinical Cases*** for publication.

We appreciate the opportunity to allow us to revise our manuscript and thanks for reviewers' constructive comments and suggestions. As suggested, we have revised our manuscript carefully, and the revised portion are highlighted in blue in the manuscript. We believe that with the revision according to the comments of the reviewers, the manuscript has been significantly improved. We have resubmitted the revised manuscript, along with the point-by-point responses below this letter. We feel great thanks for your time and professional review work on our article and hope that this revised version is acceptable for publication in your journal.

Thanks again for your reconsideration of publishing our manuscript in your journal. We are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,
Ya-Nan Wang

Response to Reviewers comments:

To Reviewer 1:

Comments : *Good paper, well written, however, some old references must be updated.*

Response: We are very sorry for our negligence of the timing of some references. We have checked the literature carefully and updated the references on rate of heterotopic pregnancy and theory of E-cadherin. And the relevant part of manuscript has been revised according to the new references.

To Reviewer 2:

Comment 1: *In general, the manuscript was interesting and informative, though a bit short - more literature could be described regarding the subject.*

Response:

We sincerely appreciate the valuable comments. We have searched more articles on heterotopic pregnancy, and rewritten the text of E-cadherin in the DISCUSSION part in

the revised manuscript to make it clearer. We highlight the revised portion in blue in the manuscript.

Comment 2: *The possible reasons of HP mentioned in the literature were well described. I suggest not writing the exact dates to the case part. Also, more indirect language should be used instead of "we did ..."*

Response:

We think this is an excellent suggestion. Thank you for your reminder. As suggested by the Reviewer, we have restructured the sentences in the manuscript and re-written this part according to the Reviewer's suggestion. We have used number of days to replace the exact date. In the original paper, I wrote: "The patient was a 26-year-old woman seen in our reproductive department in July. " It now reads: "Three months before, the patient presented to our reproductive department with a complaint of infertility."

And direct language are re-written. In the original paper, I wrote: "After completion of this oral management, we continued the COH with urofollitropin for injection (uFSH) (75 units qd) for four days, with addition of the same dose of menotrophin for the following four days." It now reads: "After completion of this oral management, the controlled ovarian hyperstimulation (COH) was continued with urofollitropin for injection (uFSH) (75 units qd) for four days, with the addition of the same dose of menotrophin for the following four days."

To Science editor:

Comment 1: *Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)*

Response:

Thanks very much for your suggestion. We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes to the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. We did not list the changes but marked in blue in the revised paper. We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly and hope that the correction will meet the publication requirement. The new language certificate will be submitted along with the manuscript.

Comment 2: *In general, do not use non-standard abbreviations, unless they appear at least two times in the text preceding the first usage/definition.*

Response:

Thanks very much for your careful checks. We feel sorry for our carelessness. Based on your comments, We have made the corrections to make the abbreviations, such as HP, ART and IVF-ET, harmonized within the whole manuscript.

According to the Editor and Reviewers' comments, we have made extensive

modifications to our manuscript and supplemented extra data to make our conclusions convincing. Thank you again for your positive comments and valuable suggestions to improve the quality of our manuscript. And according to the format and guidelines supported by you, we structured our paper carefully.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding our submission. If there are any modifications we could make, we would like to modify them and we really appreciate your help.