

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Minor revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The manuscript (number: 58972) entitled "Surgical experience of multiple magnets ingestion in children: A single-center study" has been reviewed. 1. Title is reflect the main subject. 2. Abstract section is sufficient. 3. keywords are reflect the focus. 4. Background is adequately. **However the purpose of the study should be stated in the introduction.** 5. Methods section is well designated. 6. The results section contains information about surgical procedures. **7. Although the discussion section is sufficient, it should be shortened by focusing on the purpose. Much literature information is included. The article should be focused on the fact that strong magnets can cause perforation in almost 75% of multiple purchases. In my opinion, laparoscopic procedures do not have much place.** 8. Tables in the manuscript are sufficient. 9. References is appropriate. 10. Manuscript is well organized.

Dear Reviewer #1:

Thank you very much for your efforts on my manuscript!

My answers are as follow.

**To point 4:** I state the purpose in the introduction and use the is red font with underlined.

**To point 7:** I really appreciate your advice, and I have tried my best to shorten the length of discussion when I was writing my manuscript. However, there are few articles had the similar sample size of magnetic foreign bodies as ours, thus, we hope to share our experiences as much as possible. Actually, all the valuable clinical experiences in our discussion are based on the numerous clinical cases, and most of them could not be observed in individual cases. Therefore, I wonder if you could allow me to retain the contents. And due to the lack of references, some parts of the discussion proposed by us are really novel. We hope that the publication of our manuscript could raise enough attentions and was cited widely.

As for the perforation rate, it does not have much significance for clinical diagnosis and treatment. As I mentioned in the discussion, a cluster of magnetic beads attract each other across the loops of bowels can localize intestinal contents which will not leak into the abdominal cavity. We mainly

focus on how to choose the appropriate surgical method to reduce the risk of abdominal infection caused by inappropriate operation. Laparoscopy is a worthwhile project in this problem and we are planning to do further research. From May 2020 to September 2020, we already performed 10 laparoscopic surgeries in dealing with magnetic foreign body ingestion, and the surgeries were successful. The surgical results were very good, and the surgical wound had also achieved the purpose of minimally invasive surgery.

At present, we do not find any relevant articles which have such a large sample size via PubMed. Therefore, we try to cover all aspects of this disease, instead of discussing a certain point in depth, and help other researchers obtain some useful experiences or inspiration. Finally, we sincerely hope that our experiences can help reducing the incidence of magnetic foreign ingestion and iatrogenic injury.

**Reviewer #2:**

**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)

**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)

**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)

**Specific Comments to Authors:** The manuscript describes a single center experience in managing magnet foreign bodies ingestions. It is well written and well structured and presents interesting clinical cases. I think could deserve a publication on the Journal.

Dear Reviewer #2:

Thank you very much for your efforts on my manuscript!

**Science editor:**

5 Issues raised: (1) The "Author Contributions" section is missing. Please provide the author contributions; (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; (8) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

**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 STROBE Statement should add the page number.

**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.

**Answer to Editorial office's comments:**

Dear Science editor, Editorial office director and Company editor-in-chief,

Thank you very much for your efforts on my manuscript! I have make revisions according to your comment and performed PPT, Word, Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form, Copyright License Agreement and the STROBE Statement, which have been uploaded as attached files.