Manuscript ID: 57182
Title: A scoring system for poor limb perfusion after limb fracture in children
Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Response to Reviewers' comments

Dear Editor,

We thank you for your careful consideration of our manuscript. We appreciate your response and overall positive initial feedback and made modifications to improve the manuscript. After carefully reviewing the comments made by the Reviewers, we have modified the manuscript to improve the presentation of our results and their discussion, therefore providing a complete context for the research that may be of interest to your readers.

We hope that you will find the revised paper suitable for publication, and we look forward to contributing to your journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us with other questions or concerns regarding the manuscript.

Best regards,
Yanjun Zhao

Reviewer #1

This paper aimed to establish a simple grading scale for vascular status (GCVS) after limb fracture in children because assessment of the vascular status following limb fracture is important to evaluate the risk of compartment syndrome. A total of 161 patients were enrolled in the study: 85 in the normal perfusion group and 76 in the poor perfusion group. Among many factors, only three were significantly different in these groups, namely skin temperature of the affected limb, skin color, and range of motion of the affected limb. The results strongly suggest that in children undergoing surgery following limb fracture, a higher GCVS score is associated with a higher occurrence of poor limb perfusion. A prospective study is required for validation. This could help prevent compartment syndrome in children after limb fracture. The title reflects the main subject of the manuscript, the abstract and key words reflect the main topics of the entire text. The results are discussed in detail using 29 references. Figure and 4 tables are good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents. The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics. I suggest that the article can be accepted for publication.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for taking the time to review our manuscript and for the comments.

Reviewer #2

Thank you for the opportunity to review this case series. The title describes the topic well. The sample size is good for a retrospective study on this topic. The article requires general English Language review. The work is done well to discuss the topic. The key question is does this merit publication in this journal or presented as an abstract or a more general paeditric journal. I do not find the novelness of the topic will benefit readers unless the sample size is large. I have asked the editors to check this. If indendeed this is one of the largest sample for paediatrics we are happy to review further.

Response: We thank the Reviewer for taking the time to review our manuscript and for the comments. We proofread the manuscript.

Editorial office

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

(1) Science editor: *1 Scientific quality: This manuscript is a retrospective study, and it does not reach the publication standard of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B and Grade D; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: Reviewer 02511796 pointed out that the work is done well to discuss the topic. The key question is does this merit publication in this journal or presented as an abstract or a more general pediatric*

journal. There is no novelness of the topic will benefit readers unless the sample size is large. 2 Language quality: Classification: Grade A and B. 3 Recommendation: Rejection.

(2) Editorial office director: *I have checked the comments written by the science editor.*

(3) 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.*

Response: We thank the Editor-in-chief, Editorial Editor, and Science Editor for their comments and for considering our manuscript for publication.

4.4 Requirements for figures: *Please provide the decomposable Figures, whose parts are all movable and editable, organize them into a PowerPoint file, and submit as "**57182-Figures.ppt**" on the system. The figures should be uploaded to the file destination of "Image File".*

Response: We now provide decomposable figures.

4.5 Requirements for tables: *Please provide the decomposable Tables, whose parts are all movable and editable, organize them into a Word file, and submit as "**57182-Tables.docx**" on the system. The tables should be uploaded to the file destination of "Table File".*

Response: We now provide the decomposable tables.

4.6 Requirements for references: *Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout. NOTE: The PMID is required, and NOT the PMCID; the PMID number can be found at https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov. (Please begin with PMID:) The DOI number can be found at http://www.crossref.org/SimpleTextQuery/. (Please begin with DOI: 10.**).*

Response: We are providing the references with the PMID and DOI.

4.7 Requirements for article highlights: *If your manuscript is an original study (basic study or clinical study), meta-analysis, or systemic review, the "Article Highlights" section should be provided. Detailed writing requirements for "Article Highlights" can be found in the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision.*

Response: The Authors' Guidelines indicate to include a Core Tip that highlights the findings of the study. Such a section is provided in the manuscript.

4.8 Language quality: *Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on*

the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Response: The manuscript was proofread.