Dear editor of the World Journal of Clinical Case

Thank you for considering our work for publication. We have read and revised the issues that were raised by the reviewers. We hope they will meet your approval.

Professor Dr. Raid M. Al-Ani

Reviewer #1:

The work is interesting other than well conducted.

Please see below several minor suggestions for improving the manuscript, which I consider potentially suitable for publication in the World Journal of Clinical Cases:

a) Please check the entire manuscript for the presence of various typos.

For instance, abstract: "correlation with (r=0.4," and "P<0.0001in", results

"ma-ternal" and "0.44and", page 11 "Table 3. Analysis," as well as many others.

Response

Thank you for your constructive criticism; the text was double-checked and revised accordingly.

b) Elabela has also been documented as a potential human tumor marker PMID: 34090960. This important information should be included

Response

The required reference was added see No.7

c) Pregnant females' median +/- SDM ages should be included in the methods

Response

Done; See page 8, the lower section highlighted in Blue

d) Please include this supporting reference for the statistical methods such as ANOVA PMID: 34970247

Response done see Ref' No 13

e) Standards deviations should be explained in Table 1

Response

Revision was made; see Table 1 highlighted in Blue

f) Vs should be in italics form. Please revise the work accordingly

Response

All were revised

g) For a better reading, I suggest removing p values, odd ratios etc., as well as bulled points from the discussion unless being strictly necessary.

Similarly, study limitations and strengths should be more prosaic

Response

The revision was made according to advice see the beginning of the discussion and the end, where the changes were highlighted in Blue.

Reviewer # 2

The special novelty was not clear

Response

Dear reviewer, thank you for the positive feedback; we really appreciate it.

The study novelty was revised to highlight what this work had added to the current knowledge. Kindly see the page 12/13 text highlighted in Green.

Reviewer # 3

1. **Abstract Part of the background can appropriately highlight the background against which Ela can predict PE.**

   Response Done as suggested.

2. **The expression of 'Ela' used in the paper is different in different positions, such as 'Ela", "Ela-," etc. It is suggested that the author use the same expression.**

   Response Thank you for raising that; it was revised all over the text

3. **In the introduction, the description of Elabela lacks references.**

   Response We added new references to the introduction see Ref 6 and 8 .

4. **The authors cited the review rather than the source literature about the controversy regarding the role of Elabela in preeclampsia.**

Response We added new references.See No. [26-28]

5. **Abbreviations of professional terms in the manuscript. Tables and figures are not marked with their full names.**

response True, we added them all Thank you for pointing that out.

6. **For the conclusion of "gestational age and platelets count showed moderate correlation," what is the author's basis for the definition of moderate?**

Response We added the statistical basis for that conclusion in the STATISTICS SECTION. See page 8 highlighted in yellow.

7. Three groups of data exist in Table 1, and the p-value is the comparison of which two groups?

Response Dear reviewer, thank you for your question regarding table one. The analysis was conducted using covariance ANOVA where the p-value represents the difference among the three groups.

To show which group has the highest difference, we use letters A, B, and C if the three groups **have no difference** between then the letter used **is the same**. While if there is a **difference** among the three groups, the group that has the highest difference got the letter **A** and so downward. we Have added the explanation as footnote to table 1 . We hope this clarification will answer your question

8. **Why was the variable significant in the one-way ANOVA not selected for further ANCOVA analysis in view of the author's choice of these variables not statistically significant?**

Response ANCOVA is a multivariate analysis and a sub-type of ANOVA test.

ANCOVA tests for the effect of continuous variables (BMI, gestational Age, mean arterial blood pressure, and platelet counts) on serum Ela in the context of PE (Categorial variable)

The apparent correlation with Pearson correlation was lost on ANCOVA multivariate analysis. We chose the most important parameter and examined them in ANCOVA to verify their contribution to Serum Ela in practice.

9. **The limitation of this manuscript lies in the small number of studies and the need for multi-center studies. The experimental results need to be verified in large-scale and multi-center data.**

Response It was revised as suggested.

10**. The language of this article needs to be improved. It is recommended to check and review this manuscript carefully, of which English grammar, spelling, and structure should be amended through a native English expression.**

Response English revision by a native English speaker was done.