

## Response to Reviewer's Comments

Editorial comments:

We are pleased to inform you that, after preview by the Editorial Office and peer review as well as CrossCheck and Google plagiarism detection, we believe that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of your manuscript (Manuscript NO.: 82189, Clinical and Translational Research) basically meet the publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology. As such, we have made the preliminary decision that it is acceptable for publication after your appropriate revision.

**Reply:** We would like to thank you and the reviewers for reviewing our manuscript (Manuscript No.: 82189) and for providing valuable feedback. We are pleased to learn that the academic quality, language quality, and ethics of our manuscript have met the publishing requirements of the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

**Reply:** Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for providing us with an assessment of its scientific and language quality, as well as your feedback on the conclusion. Although we received a grade of C for scientific quality, we were pleased to receive a grade of B for language quality." We appreciate

your recognition of the quality of our work and are pleased to inform you that we have made the necessary changes to the manuscript in response to your feedback.

Regarding the conclusion, we have made the minor revisions necessary to improve its clarity and coherence. We are grateful for your comments and suggestions, which have helped us to enhance the quality of our manuscript. We value your time and expertise in reviewing our work and are committed to addressing your comments constructively.

Specific Comments to Authors:

(1) The writing format of this article is not standard and uniform. For example, some paragraphs have Spaces before them, while others do not.

**Reply:** Thank you for bringing this to our attention, and we apologize for any confusion caused. We recognize the importance of uniform formatting for readability and have taken steps to address this concern. We have reviewed and revised the article to ensure consistent spacing between paragraphs throughout the document.

(2) There are too few references cited in this paper, and there are many uncited places that should be cited.

**Reply:** Thank you for your suggestion. We conducted a thorough review of the document and identified the areas where additional references were needed. We have added relevant references to these sections and cited them

where necessary.

(3) The references are not latest, please try to cite the literatures within the recent 5 years.

**Reply:** Thank you for your feedback regarding the reference list. We have addressed this concern and have included additional references of studies published within the last 5 years and have cited them as suggested. We appreciate your guidance on this matter and recognize the importance of using the current literature to support our research. In the future, we will prioritize the latest research in our work.

(4) A full review is recommended as small drafting errors can be detected throughout the document.

**Reply:** Thank you for your recommendation on the need to conduct a full review of our manuscript to detect small drafting errors. We have dedicated significant efforts to ensure that the language quality of the manuscript has been improved. We have reviewed the document thoroughly and corrected all small drafting errors that were identified. Additionally, we utilized the services of a professional editing company, as suggested on your website, to further enhance the clarity and coherence of our manuscript. We have attached a new language certificate as evidence of these efforts.