

ANSWERING REVIEWERS

Name of Journal: World

J Clin Cases

Manuscript NO: 84578

Manuscript type: LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Idrissov KS & Mynbaev OA. Respiratory-hemodynamic disturbances in surgery: erroneous presentation.

Checklist for the letter to the editor

1 Revised manuscript – Yes

2 Answering reviewers – Yes

3 Copyright assignment – Yes

4 Audio core tip – Yes, MP3

5 Conflict-of-interest – Yes

6 Google Scholar – Yes (app.grammarly.com Grammarly plagiarism checker)

Google: <https://app.grammarly.com/ddocs/2025193024> 1% of your text matches: “With great interest, we read an article by” ... This is the standard sentence for the letter to the editor.

7 Cross Check – Yes (quillbot.com/plagiarism-checker) Instead of the Cross Check we used the quillbot software. <https://quillbot.com/plagiarism-checker?scanId=6446c957506e9920ca0847a2>

8 Language certificate - Yes

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

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

ANSWER: Thank you for accepting our letter to the editor. We will revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions.

(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 B (Very good)

ANSWER: Thank you very much for your peer-review for the first decision.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, 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. 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. 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) 2023. 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.

ANSWER: Thank you for your review of our manuscript. According to your comments we prepared the figure using the PowerPoint and formatted accordingly. The original data in Table from previously published article was provided and explained that we generated the figure in our letter with using Graph Pad Prism 8.4.2 software and inserted “Copyright ©The Author(s) 2023” in the power point file. Our original figures prepared in tiff format.

Table 1 was formatted according to guidelines of your journal.

BPG Editorial Office <editorialoffice@wjgnet.com

Dear Dr. Mynbaev,

We are pleased to inform you that, after preview by the Editorial Office and peer review as well as CrossCheck and Google plagiarism detection, we believe that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of your manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 84578, Letter to the Editor) basically meet the publishing requirements of the *World Journal of Clinical Cases*. As such, we have made the preliminary decision that it is acceptable for publication after your appropriate revision. Upon our receipt of your revised manuscript, we will send it for re-review. We will then make a final decision on whether to accept the manuscript or not, based upon the reviewers’ comments, the quality of the revised manuscript, and the relevant documents.

Please follow the steps outlined below to revise your manuscript to meet the requirements for final acceptance and publication.

1 MANUSCRIPT REVISION DEADLINE

We request that you submit your revision in no more than **14 days**. **Please note that you have only two chances for revising the manuscript.**

2 PLEASE SELECT TO REVISE THIS MANUSCRIPT OR NOT

Please login to the F6Publishing system at <https://www.f6publishing.com> by entering your registered E-mail and password. After clicking on the “Author Login” button, please click on “Manuscripts Needing Revision” under the “Revisions” heading to find your manuscript that needs revision. Clicking on the “Handle” button allows you to choose to revise this manuscript or not. If you choose not to revise your manuscript, please click on the “Decline” button, and the manuscript will be WITHDRAWN.

3 SCIENTIFIC QUALITY

Please resolve all issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report and make a point-by-point response to each of the issues raised in the peer review report. Note, authors must resolve all issues in the manuscript that are raised in the peer-review report(s) and provide point-by-point responses to each of the issues raised in the peer-review report(s); these are listed below for your convenience:

ANSWER: Thank you for your preliminary decision for acceptance of our manuscript. We wrote this manuscript ourselves without using any other sources for plagiarism. In our manuscript we mentioned with citations discussed fragments from previously published article in your journal. We will revise our manuscript to meet the requirements for final acceptance.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a nicely done re-analysis of a previously published paper that appears to demonstrate some real shortcomings in the previous work. It would benefit from proofreading by a native English speaker to improve the syntax.

ANSWER: Thank you very much for your review our manuscript. We revised our manuscript with proofreading our native English colleague.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Thank you for the article. Unfortunately, I could not read the original article as it was not open access. However, from what I understand in the letter it is likely that an incorrect statistical method of analysis was performed instead of the ones presented by the author; ANOVA which is being used as parametric test. It is also true that variations may occur depending on the presentation of malignancy as the operative procedure of a gastric or colon cancer would differ. It would be important then to delineate this in the study population. If cases where procedures were converted to open laparotomy in cases of laparoscopic operations, it would

invariably increase OT time/affect post-surgery inflammatory markers. If such patients were not accepted in the study it would be ideal to include it in the exclusion criteria if it was not written. The authors have brought up some valid points for discussion and I commend their knowledge on statistics and data analysis. It is only fair the author of the article in question is given the opportunity to explain and defend his/her paper. Aside from that, there are only minor grammatical and sentencings error; most notably 'lymphatic noodle'.

ANSWER: Thank you very much for your review our manuscript. We revised our manuscript with proofreading our native English colleague. That mistake 'lymphatic noodle' was inserted accidentally when we performed the final grammar check of our manuscript with using the Grammarly software.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade E (Do not publish)

Language Quality: Grade D (Rejection)

Conclusion: Rejection

Specific Comments to Authors: In this report, there is no significant data. It is better to include more data for publication.

ANSWER: Thank you very much for your review our manuscript. We realize that our work is the letter to the editor prepared according to guidelines of this journal with limited number of words and illustrations. The letter to the editor should not have original data. This kind of publications (letters to the editor) will help to readers and the editorial committee to increase quality of scientific articles and research.