

Jin-Lei Wang, Company Editor-in-Chief, Editorial Office
World Journal of Clinical Cases

Re: Manuscript NO.: 78786

August 24, 2022

Dear Editor-in-Chief Wang,

We have attached a copy of our revised manuscript entitled "Coxsackievirus A6 was the most common enterovirus serotype causing hand, foot, and mouth disease in Shiyan City, central China". We want to thank you and the reviewers for carefully reading the manuscript and for the helpful comments.

We have carefully addressed the reviewer's questions and the editorial office's comments point-by-point (please refer to the following pages for the details of the change).

As suggested, we have rewritten the discussion section via a complete literature review and a proper comparison with the other's findings and adding the limitations. We have also provided the ethics code.

We believe that the revised manuscript has been substantially improved and hope it meets the standard for publication in the World Journal of Clinical Cases. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely yours,

Jingfeng LI, M.D., Chief Physician

Department of Pediatrics, Taihe Hospital, Hubei University of Medicine
Shiyan 442000, Hubei, P. R. China

Tel: 86-13972468406

E-mail: zihe1206@126.com

RESPONSES TO THE REFEREE'S COMMENTS (blue texts are the original comments)

Many thanks for the valuable comments on the manuscript. We have made a substantial revision to the manuscript. Please see below for details of our responses to your comments.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: I had the opportunity to read your paper. The topic and findings were interesting, paper is well-written and visualized properly. **I recommend publication after editing the discussion section via a complete literature review and a proper comparison with the others findings and adding the limitations. + providing the ethics code.**

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have rewritten the discussion section via a complete literature review and a proper comparison with the other's findings and adding the limitations. Please see the Discussion section (pages 11-13). We have also provided the ethics code in the Materials and Methods section (page 6, paragraph 3) and the Footnotes section (page 24, paragraph 1).

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? Yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes 6 Results. Are the

research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? Yes. The findings are interesting 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? No. **The literature review is not notable and limitations of study are not mentioned.**

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. We have rewritten the discussion section Please see the Discussion section (pages 11-13). The limitations of the study were also supplemented in the Discussion section (page 13, lines 6-8).

8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? they're ok 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? they're ok 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? they're ok 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Yes 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case

Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? **The ethical code is not provided.**

Response: Thank you for reminding us of that. We have provided the ethical code the ethics code in both the Materials and Methods section (page 6, paragraph 3) and the Footnotes section (page 24, paragraph 1).

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: The study is interesting. The Discussion section can **mention the limitations**, if any. Also, **English language usage can be improved.**

Response: Thank you for reminding me. We have included the limitations of the study in the Discussion section (page 13, lines 6-8). A native English editor has revised the English language.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

1. Science editor:

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)

2. 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, **please upload the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board's official approval in official language of the authors' country to the system**; 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: We have uploaded the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board's official approval in Chinese to the system.

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.

Response: We have provided original pictures using PowerPoint to ensure 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) 2022.**

Response: All pictures are 'original'. We have added the copyright information to the bottom right-hand side of the picture in PowerPoint (PPT).

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.

Response: Many thanks for your reminder. We have provided standard three-line tables.

Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response: We have uploaded the approved grant application forms attached to the revised manuscript.

Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript.

Response: We have supplemented and improved the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results to further improve the content of the manuscript. In the revised manuscript, there are 4 references published in the year 2022, including ref. 39, 54, 55, 63.

To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: <https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/>.

Response: Thank you very much for your help.