

## List of Responses

Dear Editor, Chief Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "**Short-term prone positioning for severe ARDS after extracorporeal circulation of aortic dissection: A case report and literature review**". These comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. We have studied the comments carefully, made corrections, and tried our best, which we hope will meet with approval. The revised portions are **marked in red** in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to Reviewers and Editorial Formatting Comments are as follows:

### Responses to the reviewer's comments:

#### Reviewer #2:

**Comment 1:** "Minor editing and language corrections are necessary."

**Response:** Thank you for your advice. The language of the manuscript was edited and polished by the MedE Medical Editing Group again.

**Comment 2:** "Title: exceeds the upper limit (18 words)."

**Response:** Thank you very much for the comment. We have adjusted the title in our text.

**Comment 3:** "Abstract: Few points need to be revised as I highlighted them in yellow color."

**Response:** Thank you, Professor, for this constructive comment. We have added the corresponding content (**Page 2 Line 23-25**). We hope that this revision is appropriate.

**Comment 4:** "Keywords: You should add another keyword to be 6 in number as per journal style."

**Response:** Thank you again, Professor, for your wonderful comment. We have added a keyword to the article (**Page 2 Line 29**).

**Comment 5:** “Introduction: a. You need to add similar cases to your case. b. This sentence "The patient’s family gave written consent to publish this report and its relevant images and test results." needs to be moved to the case presentation section. Besides, there is a contradiction between what was written in this sentence and in the declaration section (Informed written consent was obtained from the patient for publication of this report and any accompanying images.)”

**Response:** Thank you very much for the helpful suggestion. a. We have added a report from Gu et al to our article (**Page 4 Line 19-20**). b. We have moved the sentence to the case presentation section (**Page 5 Line 22-24**), and we have corrected it (**Page 13 Line 18-19**).

**Comment 6:** “Case presentation a. I think it is better to mention more about the follow-up period. b. Other notes should be revised as they appeared in the main file.”

**Response:** We appreciate you for the comments.

Thank you respected professor for this constructive comment. Similar to other heart and large vessel diseases after cardiopulmonary bypass, ARDS can occur to varying degrees, and some patients are very serious, such as this patient. In the early stage, intermittent short-term prone ventilation, which indeed improved the oxygenation of patients and was well tolerated by the patient, and the patient was successfully weaned from mechanical ventilation after a week of treatment. Unfortunately, after that, the patient experienced other severe infections and died from the persistent infection.

Although the outcome of the patient was changed due to later severe infection, after multidisciplinary discussion, we thought that the early prone position ventilation of the patient was indeed helpful to improve the ARDS status of the patient after cardiopulmonary bypass, and the patient did benefit, and was able to wean from mechanical ventilation as quickly as possible.

It is true that there is no longer follow-up here, but it does not affect the main conclusions of this paper. Regarding intermittent short-term prone ventilation, we have been using it in subsequent treatment of similar patients, and the effect has been preliminarily verified. We are currently conducting a larger sample cohort study. We hope to share this case report earlier with more peer researchers and doctors. Subsequent cohort studies will further validate its effects, complications, and limitations.

Thanks again for your constructive comments.

**Comment 7:** "Discussion a. It is unacceptable to see the discussion in one paragraph.  
b. There is not enough literature review as the title said."

**Response:** Thank you, Professor, for this suggestion. We have revised it in the paper and conducted more literature review.

**Comment 8:** "References: Should follow the journal style."

**Response:** Thank you very much for the comment. We have adjusted them in the article.

**Comment 9:** "Some sentences need a reference. I highlighted them in yellow color in the main file."

**Response:** Thank you very much for the comment. We have added some references according to your comment (**Page 8 Line 5-8**).

**Comment 10:** "Other minor comments should be corrected as I mentioned in the main manuscript file."

**Response:** Thank you again, Professor, for your wonderful comment. We have made corresponding revisions in the manuscript according to your comment and marked in red.

**Thank you very much again for all your helpful comments on this report. We hope our revision will meet your point of view.**