

Manuscript NO: 69218

Title: *Congenital muscular dystrophy caused by B3GALNT2 gene mutation: A report of two cases and literature review*

Journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Response to Reviewers' comments

Dear Jin-Lei Wang,

*We thank you for your careful consideration of our manuscript entitled “**Congenital muscular dystrophy caused by B3GALNT2 gene mutation: A report of two cases and literature review.**” We appreciate your response and overall positive initial feedback and made modifications to improve the manuscript. After carefully reviewing the comments made by the Reviewers, we have modified the manuscript in accordance with the comments. We have addressed each of the comments and point-by-point responses are given below. The main manuscript has been modified accordingly where required. The author has provided the signed informed consent forms for reporting these two cases. A CARE checklist is also included.*

We hope that you will find the revised paper suitable for publication, and we look forward to contributing to your journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us with other questions or concerns regarding the manuscript.

Best regards

Baoguang Li, MD

Department of Neurology

Hebei Children's Hospital affiliated to Hebei Medical University

Shijiazhuang, Hebei, China

E-mail: 317491448@qq.com

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: *Grade C (Good)*

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

Conclusion: *Major revision*

Specific Comments to Authors: *I have read the attached paper and make the following comments: In the abstract, the word ‘nevertheless’ in the following quotation is superfluous and should be removed, “...Nevertheless, the clinical phenotypes...”*

Response: *Thank you for your overall positive review and constructive comments on our manuscript. The word has been removed as suggested.*

I strongly believe that scientific publications should be in third person, past tense, rather than first person as is the case in the following quotation, taken from the case report, “...We retrospectively reported 2 children.” In that same quotation, it is impossible to report something other than in retrospective situation as one cannot predict that a case will happen, especially have only 2 examples thereof.

Response: *We have deleted “retrospectively” and the third person has been used in this instance as well as throughout the manuscript.*

There should not be a comma before a conjunctive, such as ‘and’ as appears in the following quotations also taken from the case report “...delay, and abnormal...” and “...mutation, and 3 of the 4 loci had...” and “...manifestations, and more than...”

Response: *As suggested, serial commas (comma placed after the penultimate item in a series) have been removed. However, in the second case, the comma in question is required as the phrase “each containing a truncated mutation and a missense mutation” needs to be set off from the preceding and following phrases. Therefore, this has been retained. Comma use has been carefully reviewed throughout the manuscript to ensure correct placement.*

The first time an acronym is use it should be given in full as per 'MRI' as also appears in the case report.

Response: *All acronyms and abbreviations have been defined in full at their first occurrence in the Abstract as well as in the main text.*

The paper is inordinately brief and fails to give sufficient material to be truly educative. Having said that, it is concise and to the point and does add to the world literature and as such would be suitable if published as a letter to the editor, should the authors accept such an approach. If a full paper is being sought then there needs to be much more material, of an educative nature, to be offered which may extend to considering a wider scope of muscular dystrophies to be considered and discussed. These 2 cases could serve as a lead in to discuss muscular dystrophies which would require much more work or alternatively this offering could be a letter to the editor.

Response: *Thank you for your suggestion. We are publishing our paper as a Case Report since in its current form the manuscript adheres to and fulfills all the points included in the CARE Checklist (which is attached). However, we would be very grateful if you could suggest what additions could be made to enhance the quality of this case report.*

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: *Grade B (Very good)*

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

Conclusion: *Accept (High priority)*

Specific Comments to Authors: *The manuscript is well written and highlights two cases of congenital dystrophy caused by mutation of B3GALNT2 gene. The fact that only 19 children with B3GALNT2 gene mutation are published makes this a significant addition to the currently available literature.*

Response: *We are very grateful to Reviewer #2 for the positive comments on this manuscript.*

Re-reviewer:

Specific Comments to Authors: *The paper still suffers from considerable language editing problems with many unnecessary words, such as however, moreover, additionally etc “Physical examination revealed a clear mind...”. What does a ‘clear mind’ mean in a 49 months or 45 month old child ? Similarly, what does ‘low muscle tension’ mean in the following quotation “He had low muscle tension...”? The authors indicated that they reverted to third person past tense but the following quotation would suggest otherwise “Additionally, we reported new symptoms of meningocele and giant arachnoid cyst...”or “thus, our findings in this case report enriched...” Having made the above criticisms, the paper reads reasonably well and should be accepted for publication if the Journal is prepared to undertake its own editing of the prevalent language problems throughout the paper. It does add to the literature and, with proper editing, would be suitable for the Journal but definitely requires the involvement of a competent editor, acknowledging that the authors are not native English soeakers.*

Response: *Thanks to the reviewers for their suggestions for cleaning up in the expression. We also recognize the editor's suggestions and have modified them in accordance with the editor's intentions. And the corresponding position of the article has been highlighted and revised in red font.*

EDITORIAL OFFICE’S COMMENTS

Issues raised: (1) The authors did not provide original pictures. 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; (2) The “Case Presentation” section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the “Case Presentation” section, and add the “FINAL DIAGNOSIS”, “TREATMENT”, and “OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP” sections to the main

text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision; And (3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout.

Response: *Thank you for your comments. We have revised the manuscript as suggested and we hope that the manuscript is now suitable for publication to the World Journal of Clinical Cases.*

- 1. Original figure documents have been provided in the present submission.*
- 2. We have added these three sections to the main text in accordance with the guidelines and requirements for manuscript revision. We have combined the Final Diagnosis, Treatment, and Outcome and Follow-up for both the cases for brevity, given that these sections are basically an overlap for both cases.*
- 3. We have provided PMID and DOI citations wherever available for all the references in the reference list. All the authors have been listed as well.*

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 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. Before its final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the Signed Informed Consent Form(s) or Document(s) of treatment. For example, authors from China should upload the Chinese version of the document, authors from Italy should upload the Italian version of the document, authors from Germany should upload the Deutsch version of the document, and authors from the United States and the United Kingdom should upload the English version of the document, etc.

Response: *Signed informed consent forms for reporting these two cases have been provided.*