Dear editor,

We sincerely thank the editor and all reviewers for their valuable feedback that we have used to improve the quality of our manuscript. The reviewer comments are laid out below in italicized font and specific concerns have been numbered. Our response is given in normal font and changes/additions to the manuscript have been highlighted in yellow text.

Responds to the reviewers' comments.

1. Comment: ① Examples include line 4 of the results in abstract, “progression; ” should be “progression;”. ② In 3.3.1, “Instead ” should be “therefore ”. ③ In the abstract, there should be a space after “Aim: ”.

Response: Thank you for your careful review. We apologize for our oversight. Based on your comments, we have made the necessary corrections to ensure consistency throughout the manuscript. Additionally, we have replaced “Instead” with “therefore” as suggested. (In 3.3.1, page15)

2. Comment: In the discussion section 4.2, the authors mentioned “Research indicates that patients often maintain overly optimistic beliefs regarding stoma reversion”. This statement is inconsistent with the survey results of this study, and the reference (PMID:19694841) provided by the authors also did not convey this conclusion.

Response: Dear editor, Thank you for editor' and reviewers' opinions, these comments are very helpful to improve the quality of the manuscript. We have re-written this part according to the Reviewer’s suggestion. Specifically, we have removed statements and corresponding topics that were inconsistent with the findings of our study and eliminated references that did not support our conclusions. This necessitated a rearrangement of the citation and reference sections, for which we apologize. (Deleted portions have been marked with strike-through, while changes have been highlighted in yellow for easy identification.) We have thoroughly reexamined the urgent desire for stoma reversal among patients with temporary colostomy, explaining the potential reasons underlying this phenomenon and suggesting strategies for healthcare practitioners to enhance patients' positivity. Additionally, we emphasized the importance of healthcare practitioners enhancing patients' understanding of potential physical changes following stoma reversal surgery. We have incorporated these revisions into Section 4.2 of the discussion (page20), with the modified sections highlighted in yellow for ease of identification.
We believe that these revisions have strengthened the overall quality and significance of our manuscript.

3. Comment: It would be better to discuss the potential limitations in this study. For example, the sample size was not large enough. What’s more, the proportion of male patients (10/12) was greater than that female of patients (2/12), thus there may be gender bias in the results.

Response: Dear editor, Thank you for editor’s and reviewers’ opinions, these comments are very helpful to improve the quality of the manuscript. As suggested by the reviewer, we have added a section titled “Strengths and Limitations” after the conclusion of the article to discuss the potential limitations of our study. Specifically, we addressed the potential impacts of insufficient sample size and gender bias on our research findings. These revisions have been incorporated into Section 6.0 “Strengths and Limitations” on page 23, with the modified sections highlighted in yellow for easy identification.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Best wishes,

Simeng, Wang