Dear Editors,

We thank you for your careful consideration of our manuscript. The authors have carefully answered the questions according to the reviewer's request, and have carefully revised the article as follows:

＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝＝

**1.Title: the main subject about fibrinogen and haemoglobin for prediction of deep endometriosis but the authors study in varies blood tests EX. C-reactive protein or thrombin time, I suggest the authors revise the title, may be "The blood test in prediction of deep endometriosis: A case-control study**

**Answer:** The title has been revised as "The blood test in prediction of deep endometriosis: A case-control study".

2. **Abstract: The abstract summarizes and reflect the work described in the manuscript.**

**Answer:Yes.**

**3. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript.**

**Answer:** Yes. The key words reflect the focus of the manuscript, which include deep endometriosis, diagnosis, fibrinogen, haemoglobin, and inflammation.

**4.The manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study. I suggest the authors to described benefit of blood test prediction of deep endometriosis, that's good than other methds EX. low cost, no radiation harmful or rapid.**

**Answer:** These suggestions have been updated in Page 5.

**5. The manuscript describe methods in adequate detail, study subjects was clear but I suggest the authors explain data gathering (from chart review or interview).**

**Answer:** The explanation about the data gathering was updated in Page 7**.**

6. **The research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study with multiple blood parameters.**

**Answer:** In the present study, we evaluate the blood homeostatic parameters and inflammatory indices for the prediction of DE. Univariate analyses and multivariate

analyses were performed. Finally, the combination of Fg and HB was demonstrated to be a reliable predictor of DE.

**7. The manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically.**

**Answer:** We have interpreted the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically in Discussion section in page 10-12.

**8. Tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents, I suggested label measurement units clearly EX. table 2 s=sec.**

**Answer:** The measurement units have been labeled clearly in table 2, table 3 and table 4.

**9.The manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics.**

Answer: The biostatistics were described clearly in page 8.

**10. The manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections.**

**Answer:** The references incited in the manuscript have been the latest, important and authoritative.

**11. There are some same references: 15 and 16, 19 and 20, 29 and 39, please delete the repeated references, and rearrange the references in numeral order.**

**Answer:** The three repeated references have been deleted and **the reference 16 and 20 are replaced by new references.** The numeral orders of the references have been rearranged in the manuscript.

We hope that you will find the revised paper suitable for publication, and we look forward to contributing to your journal. Once again, thank you very much for your valuable comments on this article.

=============================

Sincerely,

Xiufeng Huang

August 30, 2021