

Answering Reviewers

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you very much for giving us this opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “Incidence, prognosis and risk factors of sepsis-induced cardiomyopathy” (Manuscript ID 66429). Based on your advice, we have coordinately revised our manuscript. These comments are very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript. Our responses to the reviewers’ concerns are given below in a point-by-point manner.

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: The authors have performed a study to demonstrate the clinical characteristics of SIC patients. There is a wealth of data presented.

Comments 1: Discussion section could elaborate on the possible postulated mechanisms for development of SIC.

Response: Thank you for this insightful suggestion. We have elaborated this point in the fifth paragraph of “Discussion” section as following:

Some previous studies showed that the mechanism of SIC was related to chemical mediators, such as endotoxins and cytokines^[1,43]. Interestingly, we found that liver failure might be a protective factor against SIC. Estrogen has an inhibitory effect on cytokines^[44], and the level of estrogen is usually high in liver failure. Further studies are

warranted to determine the role of estrogen and liver failure in the pathogenesis of SIC.

Comments 2: Manuscript needs extensive editing for grammar and language.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this problem. We have carefully rechecked our manuscript and re-edited our manuscript by American Journal Experts (AJE). We have uploaded the new language editing certificate.

Comments 3: Abstract Background 2nd line : lack =====> lacking

Response: We are very sorry for this mistake. We have revised it.

Comments 4: Methods: Describe secondary outcomes in methods.

Response: Thank you for the instructive suggestion. We have revised our manuscript, reporting the secondary outcomes in “Methods” section of “Abstract”.

Comments 5: Results 4th line : had a Significant =====> were of older age

Response: Thank you for the useful suggestion. We have revised it as following: Compared to patients in the non-SIC group, patients in the SIC

group were of older age.

Comments 6: Background mortality of SIC varied greatly ==>patients with SIC

Response: Thank you for pointing out this problem. We have revised this sentence as following: Furthermore, the mortality of patients with SIC varied greatly among the studies.

Comments 7: further investigate these issues===> recommend grammatical corrections.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this problem and for the useful suggestion. We have carefully rechecked our manuscript and re-edited our manuscript. The sentence was revised as following: To further investigate the clinical characteristics of SIC, we performed a large-scale, retrospective study.

Comments 8: Discussion, “patients in the SIC group received more norepinephrine and vasopressin use[14]. In the study by Pulido and colleagues, patients in the SIC group received more norepinephrine treatment” =====> should be more patients in SIC group received norepinephrine and vasopressin.

Response: Thank you for the insightful suggestion. We have revised this sentence as following: Ryota and coworkers also reported that more

patients in the SIC group received norepinephrine and vasopressin ^[14]. In the study by Pulido and colleagues, more patients in the SIC group received norepinephrine ^[18].

Comments 9: And it is interested that we found liver failure might be a protect factor of SIC.====> please correct grammatical errors.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this problem. We have revised this sentence as following: Interestingly, we found that liver failure might be a protective factor against SIC.

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: We have carefully rechecked our manuscript and re-edited our manuscript by American Journal Experts (AJE). We also have uploaded the new language editing certificate.

Science editor: The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this problem. We have added the

“Article Highlights” section at the end of the “Conclusion” section.

Company editor-in-chief: Before its final acceptance, please upload the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board’s official approval in official language of the authors’ country to the system.

Response: Thank you for pointing out this problem. We have uploaded the primary version (PDF) of the Institutional Review Board’s official approval.