

Point-by-point response to reviewer comments

Associate Editor Comments to Author:

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent)

Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)

Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Interesting case, good job

Response: Thank you for your review and comment.

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the end-of-life care of an interstitial pneumonia patient at home supported by High Flow Nasal Cannula therapy and morphine continuous subcutaneous injection with Patient Controlled Analgesia device. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade A; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This case reported an interesting case; and (3) Format: There are 1 figure. A total of 24 references are cited, including 9 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade A. A language editing certificate issued by Editage was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the written informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. No financial support was obtained for the study. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. 5 Issues raised: (1) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words; (2) 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; (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; and (4) 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. 6 Re-Review: Not required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: Thank you for your review and comments.

- (1) We changed the title to ensure that it is within the 18-word limit required by the journal.
- (2) We provided the original pictures as PowerPoint files.
- (3) We provided the PubMed and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and listed all authors in each reference entry.
- (4) We re-wrote the "Case Presentation" section and added the "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.

(2) Editorial office director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor. The authors must provide the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement. The CARE Checklist–2016 has been provided by the authors.

Response: Thank you for your review and comment. We provided the signed Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and Copyright License Agreement.

(3) 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. The title of the manuscript is too long and must be shortened to meet the requirement of the journal (Title: The title should be no more than 18 words).

Response: Thank you for your review and comment. We changed the title accordingly to meet the journal requirement of 18 words.