Dear Editorial Committee:

Please see our point by point responses to the reviewers. Responses are highlighted in green.

Response to Reviewers:

Reviewer #1:
**Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good)
**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)
**Conclusion:** Major revision
**Specific Comments to Authors:** Dear Author, thank you for sharing your experience with us. Good luck.

Thank you for your kind wishes. There is nothing to address for Reviewer 1.

Reviewer #2:
**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)
**Language Quality:** Grade A (Priority publishing)
**Conclusion:** Accept (General priority)
**Specific Comments to Authors:** 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 if does 3 Key Words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes they do, it feels like they could add another key word 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? To a fair extent 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes they do 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? This is a case report and the case is fairly described 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 they do 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 they do 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? Yes they do 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? Yes 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? literature cited are relevant 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? Quality of manuscript is acceptable 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? 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? The statement on ethics is not clear. The ethics statement requires more details.

Thank you for your thorough review. It appears that the only criticism is that statement on ethics is not clear and requires more details. This is a case report and thus does not qualify as “research,” be it human subject or otherwise. Thus, it is exempt from IRB. Please refer to below:

https://www.hopkinsmedicine.org/institutional_review_board/guidelines_policies/guidelines.case_report.html

Moreover, there are no identifiers used and there is no risk to the patient presented in the case. For this reason, we do not list express IRB approval for this report nor did we get informed consent from the patient as this is not required by US academic institutions (including our own) for this type of report.

Accordingly, we have added the following to the main text and hope it will be satisfactory:

"For human subjects research, the investigation was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki of 1975 and/or all regulatory and compliance requirements established by local Institutional Review Board."