

3rd February 2024

RESPONSE LETTER

Dear Editors,

We thank you and the reviewers for the time and effort vested to improve the quality of our manuscript now titled "Sepsis During Short Bowel Syndrome Hospitalizations: Identifying Trends, Disparities and Clinical Outcomes in the United States" submitted to World Journal of Gastrointestinal Pathophysiology.

Please see our point-by-point response to all the reviewer comments below. These comments have also been incorporated in the manuscript and the manuscript has been addended appropriately. Furthermore, the manuscript has been revised again thoroughly for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.

Please feel free to reach out to me at any time regarding the manuscript at dush.dahiya@gmail.com

Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Dushyant Singh Dahiya, MD

Division of Gastroenterology, Hepatology & Motility

The University of Kansas School of Medicine

Kansas City, Kansas, USA 66103

dush.dahiya@gmail.com

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE TO REVIEWER COMMENTS

Reviewer #1:

Author Response: We would like to thank you for taking the time out to review our manuscript. We highly appreciate your efforts and enthusiasm in helping us improve the quality of our work. Please note that we have addended the manuscript appropriately per your suggestions. Furthermore, the manuscript has been revised again thoroughly for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.

(1) Is the manuscript important/innovative and why? In particular, does it contain new concepts, hypotheses, and/or mechanistic, diagnostic or therapeutic information, or does it represent a state-of-the-art review of the topic? YES

Author Response: Thank you for the acknowledgement.

(2) Is the manuscript well, concisely, and coherently organized and presented? Needs improvement.

Author Response: Thank you for your remarks. We have addended the manuscript appropriately per your suggestions. The manuscript has also been revised again thoroughly for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.

1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? YES 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? YES 3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? YES 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? NO 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe

methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? YES, but further details has to be provided, as noted below. 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? YES 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? YES 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams, and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative, with labeling of figures using arrows, asterisks, etc, and are the legends adequate and accurately reflective of the images/illustrations shown? YES 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? YES, but further details has to be provided, as noted below. 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? N/A 11 References. Does the manuscript appropriately cite the latest, important and authoritative references in the Introduction and Discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? Please refer to comments 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Good 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to BPG's standards for manuscript type and the appropriate topically-relevant category, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. For (6) Letters to the Editor, the author(s) should have prepared the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting. Letters to the Editor will be critically evaluated and only letters with new important original or complementary information should be considered for publication. A Letter to the Editor that only recapitulates information published in the article(s) and states that more studies are needed is not acceptable?

YES 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? YES

Author Response: Thank you for your remarks and acknowledgement. We have addended the manuscript appropriately as per your suggestions.

I appreciate the opportunity to review this retrospective study, titled "Sepsis During Short Bowel Syndrome Hospitalizations: Identifying Trends, Disparities, and Clinical Outcomes in the United States." The study addresses an important topic in gastroenterology and demonstrates good methodological quality.

Author Response: Again, we would like to thank you for taking the time out to review our manuscript and helping us improve the quality of our work.

Here are my specific comments: In the introduction, please elaborate further on the background of the topic and whether there are studies conducted outside of the US.

Author Response: Thank you for your comment. We appreciate you helping us improve the quality of our work. We agree with you. Ideally, we would have liked to give more background on septic SBS hospitalizations. However, current literature is very limited in terms of data for adult SBS hospitalizations in the US and across the globe. There is a significant lack of large prospective studies on this topic. We have addended the manuscript appropriately to reflect this point in the introduction. Furthermore, we have revised the introduction section thoroughly again for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.

Given the mention of a significant paucity of data on adult SBS hospitalizations complicated by sepsis in the United States, it would be beneficial to provide context on international studies or lack thereof.

Author Response: Thank you for your comment. We agree with you. Ideally, we would have liked to provide an international context and compare it with data from the US for the readers to further highlight if global/population differences exist for the clinical entity. However, due to lack of data on this clinical entity both in the US and across the globe, we were unable to do so. We have addended the manuscript appropriately to reflect this point in the introduction. Furthermore, we have revised the introduction section thoroughly again for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.

In the final paragraph of the introduction, explicitly articulate the primary and secondary objectives of the study, identify the target population under investigation, and delineate the key parameters being studied. This will provide readers with a clear roadmap for comprehending the study's purpose and focus, fostering a more precise understanding of the research scope and goals.

Author Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We appreciate it. As this is a national database study, we did not have secondary endpoints. All the data points in our study are primary endpoints. We have addended the manuscript appropriately to highlight all the data points assessed in our study in the introduction. Furthermore, we have revised the introduction section thoroughly again for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.

In the statistical analysis, add details on how matching was done. Additionally, I recommend including a table that presents patients' demographics before and after matching.

Author Response: Thank you for raising an excellent point. For this study, Statistical Analysis Software 9.3 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA) was used for univariate and multivariate analyses. We used weighted values provided by HCUP to produce nationally representative estimates for all variables. Categorical variables like gender, race, and comorbidities were compared using the Chi-squared (χ^2) test, and

continuous variables like age and LOS were compared using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test. We also created a multivariate logistic regression model to determine predictors of inpatient mortality for SBS hospitalizations complicated by sepsis. During the analysis process, no matching was performed. Hence, we would be unable to provide details on this. Details of trends, patient characteristics, clinical outcomes, and gender/racial disparities of Elixhauser co-morbidities for septic SBS hospitalizations are provided in table 1-5.

Add a reference after each sentence containing ideas taken from other studies.

Author Response: Thank you for your comment. We have added the manuscript appropriately to ensure references are added where appropriate. Furthermore, we have revised the manuscript thoroughly again for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.

Consider adding an abbreviation section at the end of the manuscript for better clarity.

Author Response: Thank you for your comment. We have added an abbreviation section.

In the discussion, enhance cohesion throughout, ensuring a smoother transition between ideas. I want to emphasize that these comments are intended to improve the paper's quality. Thank you for the opportunity, and I look forward to seeing an enhanced version of the manuscript.

Author Response: Thank you for your comment. We have added the manuscript appropriately to ensure this. Furthermore, we have revised the manuscript thoroughly again for grammatical errors and to ensure accuracy of reporting.