

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for your careful review and constructive suggestions with regard to our manuscript “**Application of apical negative pressure irrigation in the nonsurgical treatment of radicular cysts: A case report**”(Manuscript NO.: 83087, Case Report). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope the revised version is suitable for publication in “**World Journal of Clinical Cases**”.

Please don't hesitate to contact us if you have further comments or a decision.

Thank you and best regards.

Dan-Hua Ling

Department of General Dentistry, the Second Affiliated Hospital of Zhejiang University School of Medicine, No. 1511 Jianghong Road, Binjiang District, Hangzhou 310052, Zhejiang Province, China. lingdanhua@zju.edu.cn

Reviewer #1:

1.Comment: The authors should follow the CARE guidelines for writing a case report.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have read the CARE Checklist (2016), and the manuscript was revised according to the CARE Checklist (2016). The CARE Checklist (2016) has been filled and uploaded at this revision.

2.Comment: As an example the authors wrote “In the present study, we aimed to evaluate the efficacy of nonsurgical endodontic treatment with an apical negative pressure irrigation system in a patient with a radicular cyst”. This is misleading, it is just one case

Response: Thank you for pointing this out and it is rectified as “In this case, the radicular cyst was in close proximity to the mandibular nerve canal. We used nonsurgical endodontic treatment with a homemade apical negative pressure irrigation system and the prognosis was good”.

3.Comment: Also, we can't conclude that “nonsurgical treatment with an apical negative pressure irrigation system can provide excellent therapeutic results for radicular cysts”. To conclude that we should perform a large scale study with adequate number of population.

Response: It is really true as reviewer suggested that we have rectified as “This report indicates that nonsurgical treatment with an apical negative pressure irrigation system may provide new insights into the treatment of radicular cysts”.

4.Comment: Typos errors and grammatical mistakes should be corrected.

Response: We are very sorry for our incorrect writing and grammatical mistakes. We have made correction according to the Reviewer's comments.

Reviewer #2

1.Comment: All the parts (introduction, case report, follow-up, discussion) should be elaborated on. The introduction should talk about the uniqueness of this particular case.

Response: Thank you for pointing this out. All the parts (introduction, case report, follow-up, discussion) have been elaborated on. The uniqueness of this particular case has been elaborated in the Introduction section “In this case report, the radicular cyst was in close proximity to the mandibular nerve canal, and there would be a high risk of damage to the mandibular nerve if surgical treatment was performed. Thus, we performed nonsurgical endodontic treatment with a homemade apical negative pressure irrigation system and achieved a good outcome. The cyst was reconstructed in three dimensions by 3D Slicer 5.0.3 software, and prognosis was evaluated by comparing changes in cyst volume. Nonsurgical endodontic treatment of large radicular cysts has remained a matter of debate, and the best possible way to treat them is still unclear. This study provides new insight into the treatment and prognostic evaluation of radicular cysts”.

2.Comment: Moreover, there should be no conclusion because this case is not enough to obtain any conclusions. Instead, warrant future studies with large samples.

Response: we have re-write this part to the reviewer’s suggestion as “This case report offers new insight into the treatment of patients with radicular cysts. Future studies with large samples are needed to evaluate the efficacy of nonsurgical endodontic treatment with apical negative pressure irrigation in patient with radicular cysts”.

3.Comment: I see some of the CARE items are not completely applied but only partially applied. Please double-check the whole CARE items and make sure you apply all of them.

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have read the CARE Checklist (2016), and the manuscript was revised according to the CARE Checklist (2016). The CARE Checklist (2016) has been filled and uploaded at this revision.

4.Comment:More high-quality images would be desirable.

Response: It is really true as reviewer suggested that we have reselected and edited the images.

Science editor:

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

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have read the reviewers' and your comments carefully and have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. The manuscript has been polished and edited.

Company editor-in-chief:

Comment: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript 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. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor. In order to respect and protect the author' s intellectual property rights and prevent others from

misappropriating figures without the author's authorization or abusing figures without indicating the source, we will indicate the author's copyright for figures originally generated by the author, and if the author has used a figure published elsewhere or that is copyrighted, the author needs to be authorized by the previous publisher or the copyright holder and/or indicate the reference source and copyrights. Please check and confirm whether the figures are original (i.e. generated de novo by the author(s) for this paper). If the picture is 'original', the author needs to add the following copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT): Copyright ©The Author(s) 2023. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response: Thanks for your comment. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope the revised version is suitable for publication in “**World Journal of Clinical Cases**”. The PPT format of Figure files has been provided. This study was supported by the Medical Health Science and Technology Project of Zhejiang Provincial Health Commission, No. 2022RC158. The approval grant documents have been provided.

Answering Re-reviewers

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches.

We appreciate your positive comments and will try our best to further improve.

Best wishes,

Dan-Hua Ling