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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers:

Thank you so much for your letter. A point-by-point response to the comments was listed as follows.

Editor Comments:

1 - Please remove the files from the file inventory that you do not wish to see published.
Answer: Thank you so much for your suggestion. We’re afraid that we were not able to find the ‘file inventory’. We want to keep the manuscript, two tables and four figures. We deleted the language certificate. If we misunderstood you, please do not hesitate to tell us and we will respond to you as soon as possible. Thank you so much again!

2 - For all research involving human subjects, informed consent to participate in the study should be obtained from participants (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 16) and a statement to this effect should appear in the ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section of the
Declarations including whether the consent was written. When reporting on such studies, individual patient data should not be made available unless consent for publication has also been obtained. If the need for informed consent has been waived by an IRB or is deemed unnecessary according to national regulations, please clearly state this with details, including the name of the Board or a reference to the relevant legislation in the ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section of the Declarations.

Throughout the manuscript the study is described as prospective except in the ethics statements, where it is stated that informed consent was waived owing to the retrospective design of the study. This appears to have been a prospective study; please modify your statements to explain the discrepancy and clarify the consent required and sought.

Answer: Thank you so much for pointing out the problem. We’re truly sorry for the mistake. It’s a prospective study and the patients signed informed consent before participating into the study as stated in the Method (please refer to Page 9, Line 155-156). The statement in the ‘Ethics approval and consent to participate’ section of the Declarations was wrong and it was corrected in the current manuscript (Page 17, Line 341-342). Thanks again!

3 - In the Funding section of the Declarations please indicate the role of the funding body in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript. If no specific funding was received for this study, please clearly indicate this in the Funding section. Answer: Thank you for the suggestion. We clarified the role of the funding body in the section. Please refer to Page 18, Line 352-353.

4- At this stage, please upload your proofread manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethrough or text in different colours. All relevant tables and figures should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only. Answer: Thank you so much for your suggestion. We’d like to show our sincere gratitude to you for great help and guidance.

Reviewer reports:

Catharina M. Korse (Reviewer 1): This paper has been excellent improved after revision. Answer: Thank you so much again for your dedication.

Gian Franco Zannoni (Reviewer 2): I think that the Authors have deeply improved their paper In this version in my opinion it is suitable for publication Answer: Thank you so much again for your help.