Response to the Academic Editor's Comment

**Response to Editor:** 

Dear Reviewer,

I am truly grateful for the time and effort you dedicated to the review process. Your review

comments demonstrated your familiarity with relevant issues in the field, and they have provided

us with valuable perspectives and suggestions. We carefully considered each of your suggestions

and made corresponding revisions based on your guidance. Once again, thank you for your patience

and professionalism. The responds to your comments are as below.

Best regards,

Shuangqin Yan

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** 

Dear Authors, Thank you for sharing your experience with us. Good luck.

**Reply:** Thank you very much for your suggestion. We have hired Enago for advanced

polishing and assisted with language polishing and formatting adjustments. We believe

these revisions and professional language editing have substantially improved our

manuscript, aligning it more closely with the journal's standards. The revised

manuscript and the certificate of editing provided by Enago are attached for your review.



## **Science editor:**

(1) The abstract should be standardized: Background, Aim, methods, results, and conclusion.

**Reply:** Thank you very much for your professional advice. We have revised the abstract of the article according to the standard format, please review it.

(2) We suggest changing the manuscript type to observational study.

**Reply:** Thank you very much for your professional advice. Thank you very much for your professional advice. Following your suggestion, I changed the manuscript type to observational research and uploaded the STROBE Statement.

Edit Delete	Supplementary Material	88360-Supplementary Material-revision.pdf	0.26MB	2023-12-29 09:25	Download
-------------	---------------------------	--	--------	---------------------	----------

(3) The labeling of P value in the figures does not meet the requirements of WJCC, please don't include any \*, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration; and for statistical significance, please use superscript letters. Statistical significance is expressed as aP < 0.05, bP < 0.01 (P > 0.05 usually does not

need to be denoted). If there are other series of P values, cP < 0.05 and dP < 0.01 are

used, and a third series of P values is expressed as eP < 0.05 and fP < 0.01.

**Reply:** Thank you for your professional advice. I have modified the p-value annotation

in the article according to the requirements of WJCC. Please review it.

(3) Please authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top

line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The

contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the

lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns

or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content.

Reply: Thank you for your professional advice. According to your requirements, I

modified and provided the standard three row table. I have submitted it as "88360-

tables.docx" on the system. Please review it.

Once again, we thank the editors as well as the reviewer for providing very important and

constructive feedback. We believe this has enhanced the quality of our work. We hope that the

reviewed and refined manuscript is at par with the standards of your prestigious journal and

manuscript is acceptable for publications.

With best regards!

Shuangqin Yan