

Point-by-point response

Peer-review:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: In this manuscript, the authors report a case of IgA nephropathy treated by professor Zou's method using traditional Chinese medicine (TCM). They conclude that this method is an effective therapy in patients with IgA nephropathy. This case report is clinically useful for readers interested in Chinese medicine. However, the following points need to be addressed. Major comments: 1. The urinary findings (proteinuria and hematuria) are very important prognostic factors in patients with IgA nephropathy. Therefore, the authors should show the course of the urinary findings before and after treatment. 2. The authors should describe the histological findings more precisely. 1) What is the percentage of sclerotic glomeruli? 2) Are there any tubulointerstitial lesions? Minor comments: 1. There are some typing errors. 1) "blood urinary nitrogen" should be changed to "blood urea nitrogen". 2) "uric acid" should be changed to "serum uric acid". 2. Because this paper is a case report, the authors should show serum cystatin C levels before and after the treatment to clarify the efficacy of TCM.

1. The urinary findings (proteinuria and hematuria) are very important prognostic factors in patients with IgA nephropathy. Therefore, the authors should show the course of the urinary findings before and after treatment.

Response: I think the reviewer's comment is very professional. I have added test results of urine protein and urinary red blood cell in the laboratory examinations.

2. The authors should describe the histological findings more precisely. 1) What is the percentage of sclerotic glomeruli? 2) Are there any tubulointerstitial lesions?

Response: More details about pathological analysis of renal biopsy sample have been added.

3. 1. There are some typing errors. 1) "blood urinary nitrogen" should be changed to "blood urea nitrogen". 2) "uric acid" should be changed to "serum uric acid". 2. Because this paper is a case report, the authors should show serum cystatin C levels before and after the treatment to clarify the efficacy of TCM.

Response: I'm sorry for the typing errors. I have corrected the typing errors in the manuscript. Serum cystatin C level tests were not performed at each visit, but all available results of serum cystatin C levels have been added in the manuscript.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

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

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The article is within the scope of the journal. And the problem described is interesting. It is well written and the case study is clearly described. However, it cannot be accepted in the current state: a) The article should be rewritten to follow a standard structure: Introduction, Materials and methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusions. b) It is necessary to carry out a study of the art of the problem dealt with. c) The results obtained with similar works should be discussed in such a way as to show the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and the experiment carried out. d) The

bibliographic base used is very limited. More bibliography should be analyzed to support the proposal made.

1. The article should be rewritten to follow a standard structure: Introduction, Materials and methods, Results, Discussion and Conclusions.

Response: Thank you for your advice. I have revised it according to this journal's requirements.

2. It is necessary to carry out a study of the art of the problem dealt with.

Response: I think it is necessary. I have added the importance of improving IgAN treatment and advantages and potential of traditional Chinese medicine in introduction to show the art of the problem.

3. The results obtained with similar works should be discussed in such a way as to show the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and the experiment carried out.

Response: I have added characteristics and comparison with similar treatment in the manuscript.

4. The bibliographic base used is very limited. More bibliography should be analyzed to support the proposal made.

Response: I have added more references in the manuscript. Thank you for all the advice.

Re-review:

Dear reviewers,

Thank you for your time reviewing our manuscript. We appreciate your positive comments and will try our best to further improve.