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.

Responds to the reviewers' comments.

Reviewer #1:

Comments: 1. The manuscript requires an editing. Some language polishings should be revised, and the format should be updated according to the journal’s guideline.

Response: 1. Dear editor, thanks for your suggestion. We have tried our best to polish the language in the revised manuscript. We've updated the formatting strictly according to the magazine's guidelines. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes. We appreciate for Reviewers’ warm work earnestly and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

Comments: 2. The discussion is too long, please try to short it.

Response: 2. Dear editor, thank you for editor' and reviewers' opinions, these comments are very helpful to improve the quality of the manuscript. We have short this part according to the Reviewer’s suggestion.

Specifically, we have removed some statements, we have incorporated these revisions into Section of the discussion (page14-16).

We believe that these revisions have strengthened the overall quality and significance of our manuscript.

Comments: 3. Some references can’t be searched. Would please provide the sources link?

Response: 3. Dear editor, I really appreciate all your comments and suggestions! I'm sorry for the problem. We've changed the formatting of the references and added links to the websites, we have tested the references by visiting the “Edit References by Auto-Analyser”. The revised section is located in the References section on pages 18-21.

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.
Specific comments (1) The language classification is Grade B. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies that we recommend: https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240.

Response:(1) We apologize for the poor language of our manuscript. We worked on the manuscript for a longtime and the repeated addition and removal of sentences and sections obviously led to poor readability.

We have now worked on both language and readability and have also involved native English speakers for language corrections. We really hope that the flow and language level have been substantially improved.

(2) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references.

Response:(2) Dear editor, thank you for editor' and reviewers' opinions. We have checked the literature carefully and added references in the references section on pages 18-21.

(3) Please provide the PubMed numbers (https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/) and DOI citation numbers (https://doi.crossref.org/simpleTextQuery) to the reference list and list all authors of the references. If a reference has no PMID and DOI, please provide the source website address of this reference.

Response:(3) Dear editor, thank you for editor' and reviewers' opinions. We have made changes to the formatting of the references. We have tested the references by visiting the “Edit References by Auto-Analyser” . The revised section is located in the References section on pages 18-21.

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.

(4) The structure of Abstract does not meet the requirements. The abstract includes five parts: "Background", "AIM", "METHODS", "RESULTS", and "CONCLUSION".

Response:(4) Dear editor, Thank you for your careful review. We have amended the summary in line with the comments to "Background", "AIM", "METHODS", "RESULTS", and "CONCLUSION", and it adds “Core Tip” on pages 2.
Response:

Dear editor,

Thank you for the thorough review and constructive suggestions. We have meticulously revised Tables 1 and 2 on pages 6-7 within the article as required, as well as Tables 3 and 4 on pages 8 and 9. We believe that these changes have ensured the normality of the manuscripts.

Thank you very much for your attention and time. Look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Rong-rong Cheng,

4 Apr. 2024