

Dear editor,

Thanks for your letter. I revised the manuscript according to the comments of the reviewers. And the changes in the manuscript are also indicated in red font. The answers to the questions from the reviewers are below.

Reviewer Comments:

Reviewer 1:

The title of the manuscript reflects the subject well, but it may be improved to emphasize the critical role of an early start of rehabilitation.

Answer: Thanks very much. I revised the title of this manuscript.

The abstract should be improved: why is it essential to study the effects of early rehabilitation? What is the background in this subject? Also, methods and results should be improved in the abstract. Careful with the abbreviations.

Answer: Thanks very much. I added the critical role and the background in the abstract. I revised the methods and results.

The keywords reflect well the focus of the manuscript. The paper is, in general, well written; the Introduction properly presents the field and the importance of this study. The material and methods section presents the data collection, with inclusion and exclusion criteria. The rehabilitation program is extensively described, including two figures. The statistical methods should be rewritten: data are expressed as mean and standard deviation and number and percentages. Too many times t-test was presented. This paragraph should be rewritten.

Answer: Thanks very much. I revised the statistical methods and shorten the T-test.

The presentation of the results should be improved as the authors should choose one method: table or text (see data from 3.2 and 3.3 as there are also presented in the text). The authors interpret the findings adequately and appropriately. They highlighted the main points of their study concisely and logically. The discussion is accurate and revealed the study's scientific significance and relevance to clinical practice. The paper includes three figures and five tables. Some of them had data that are also presented in the text. Figure 3 may be improved.

Answer: Thanks very much. The result in Figure 3 and table 4 might be repeated. I delete the figure 3 in the manuscript.

The manuscript cites appropriately essential references in the introduction and discussion sections. There are 21 references, almost 2/3 from the last 5 years. The manuscript is well organized and presented. The style and language are accurate. Just some editing and improvement of the use of the abbreviations (ROM, AROM, PROM – AROM is not defined in the text, only in the abstract, where ROM is not defined). Better to be strict with these definitions.

Answer: Thanks very much. I added the definition of the abbreviation for the first time in the text and upload references.

The authors include the ethics approval and consent to participate statements. The paper presents an interesting retrospective study on the positive role of an early rehabilitation program

in managing pediatric burnt hands. After the early intervention, a significant improvement in the active range of motion was demonstrated. Also, hand function improvement was correlated with the time from onset to post-traumatic rehabilitation intervention and the lengths of the rehabilitation program. The conclusions summarize the data presented in the study, but in my opinion, it may be shortened. The authors may add a paragraph with the limitations and strengths of this study and another one on future directions on this research and the importance of future clinical practice guidelines.

Answer: Thanks very much. I shortened the conclusion and added the paragraph with limitation and future directions.

Reviewer 2: Maybe it's better to have a long-term follow due to their trauma / scar

Answer: Thanks very much. In this study I tried to contact the included patients to analyze the long-term effect (about 6 months or 1 year) of the treatment. But only 6 of 52 patients returned to hospital to get the long-term effect assessment. Other included patients lacked the long-term effect assessment because of long distance from home to hospital (most of the patients needed to cross from one province to another province) and the financial burden. So in our study we lack analysis of the long-term effect assessment.

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study on the effects of early rehabilitation on the treatment of pediatric burn injuries to the hand. The manuscript type designated by the author is consistent with the content of the manuscript. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B (1) and Grade C (1). (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors have described the value of early rehabilitation for the treatment of burn injuries to the hand in children. It is unclear in the manuscript for how long the patients were followed and evaluated. The statistical analysis relies overmuch in presenting p values, while other important parameters are missing. Inclusion of a paragraph with the limitations and strengths of this study and the future directions on this research could increase the scientific value of the manuscript.

Answer: Thanks very much. The time of patients received rehabilitation were described in Table 1. Patients received evaluation before and after the last rehabilitation treatment. Therefore the length of rehabilitation and evaluation was the same. I added the length in the result of Demographic data. Meanwhile I revised the statistical methods, shortened the T-test and added the paragraph with limitation and future directions according to the questions of reviewer 1.

(3) Format: There are 5 figures and 4 tables in the manuscript, and all figures are of high quality.

(4) References: Citation of references in the manuscript is sufficient and reasonable. A total of 21 references are cited, of which only 3 references were published in the last 3 years.

Answer: Thanks very much. I updated the new references.

(5) Self-cited references: There are three self-cited references in the manuscript (numbers 2, 5 and 6).

Answer: Thanks very much. I deleted one of the self-cited references (number 2).

(6) References recommendations: The reviewers made no references recommendations. 2

Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B (2). The authors have provided a language editing certificate from AJE. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors have sent a Signed Informed Consent Form, an Institutional Review Board Approval Form, which are correctly provided and meet the standard requirements. Possible conflicts of interest from the authors were not disclosed in the manuscript.

Answer: Thanks very much. There was the 'Competing interests' in the end of the manuscript which declared the conflicts of interest.

The Biostatistics Review Certificate states that the ethics application for the study was reviewed, rather than the manuscript itself. No academic misconduct was found by the Google/Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. Financial support was not disclosed in the manuscript. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC.

Answer: Thanks very much. There was the 'Funding' in the end of the manuscript.

5 Issues raised: (1) The reviewer has pointed out that the follow-up time was unclear, please clarify this aspect in the manuscript.

Answer: Thanks very much. I added the follow-up time in the result of Demographic data.

(2) The statistical analysis is overly reliant on p values. Inclusion of other parameters that are present in the tables, such as means and SD, in the body of the text (Sections 3.3 and 3.4) should be considered, as suggested by the reviewer.

Answer: Thanks very much. I revised the statistical methods and shorten the T-test according to the comments of reviewer1.

(3) Please consider the inclusion of a paragraph with the limitations and strengths of this study and the future directions on this research in the discussion, as suggested by our reviewer.

Answer: Thanks very much. I added the paragraph with limitation and future directions according to the questions of reviewer1.

(4) There are 3 self-cited references (numbers 2, 5 and 6). According to our guidelines, the self-referencing rate should be less than 10%. Please make the corresponding modifications.

Answer: Thanks very much. I deleted one of the self-cited references(number2).

(5) Please disclose if the authors have any conflicts of interest and if there were any sources of financial support in the manuscript.

Answer: Thanks very much. There was the 'Competing interests' in the end of the manuscript which declared the conflicts of interest. Meanwhile there was the 'Funding' in the end of the manuscript.

(6) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the references. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Answer: Thanks very much. I added the PMID and DOI numbers in the reference list. But the reference 21 has only PMID without DOI.

(2) *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).

Answer: Thanks very much. I revised the title according to the reviewer1. The title was 11 words.