

Radiological features of pygopagus conjoined twins: a case reportShirin M *et al.* (m.shirin1970@gmail.com)**Technical review**

Reviewer's information			
Date review assigned	22-May-2024	Date review completed	22-May-2024
Reviewer name	Md. Nazmul Hasan	Do you have any conflict of interest with the author/s?	No
ORCID	0000-0002-5737-5124	Do you wish to be disclosed to the author?	Yes
Reviewer's comments (22-May-24)		Author's response (24-May-24) [Please write a response to each point. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers. Write response if score is less than 6]	
How would you rate the originality and depth of the manuscript?	8	-	
Is the manuscript written in a scholarly manner?	9	-	
Does the manuscript have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the world of knowledge?	7	-	
Does the manuscript meet ethical standards?	8	-	
Minor points: 1) Article did not follow the journal's guideline for case report writing. Please address the issue. 2) Some short form should be elaborated in line 68(S5),69(S2) and 161(P/R) in the abstract section. 3) In the case management section, final outcome could be mentioned in short if available now. 4) The conclusion paragraph from line 166 to 173 : Please make it short and specific.		1) Following the revised guidelines for case report writing, we have adjusted our article accordingly: reducing the word count to 747 words (within the 750-word limit), limiting it to one image (Figure 1) from the initial two images (figure 1 and Figure 2), merging the case description and case management into one section (Case Description and Management), and removing the abstract section. 2) We have removed the entire abstract section, we couldn't elaborate in the line 68(S5) and 69 (S5), which instead we elaborated in line 86 (S5:5th sacral vertebra) and in line 92 (S2:2nd sacral vertebra). We have elaborated in line 161, now line 89 (P/R: per-rectal), in the case description and management section. 3) We agree with the reviewer's comment that as the final outcome is now available, we should include it in the article. So, we have added the final outcome briefly as follows: "To successfully separate the babies, a transverse loop colostomy was initially performed. Subsequently, a single-session separation surgery was completed without complications, separating the dural sac, sacral vertebra, and overlying soft tissue and skin. Separate anal canals were reconstructed for each baby. Currently, both babies are healthy, and their wounds are healing well." in the case description and management section from line 96 to line 100. 4) We concur with the reviewer's feedback and have shortened and specified the conclusion paragraph as follows: "In summary, conjoined twins exhibit a wide variety of foetal connections and anomalies. Evaluating conjoined twins requires specific imaging modalities based on the primary site of conjunction. While a general guideline exists, as each case is unique, they	

		necessitate precise imaging tailored to the specific twins and the requirements of the attending paediatric surgeons.” which was previously from lines 166 to 173, now located from lines 118 to 122.
Reviewer’s Recommendation	Revisions Required	

Executive Editor’s comments (22-May-24)		Author’s response (24-May-24)
Name	M Mostafa Zaman	[Please write a response to each point. You must change the manuscript as per your response. Mention line numbers.]
ORCID	0000-0002-1736-1342	
1) The word count should not exceed 750 and one image.		1) We have reduced the word count to 747 words and limited it to one image (Figure 1) from the initial two images (figure 1 and Figure 2).
2) The case description and case management should be merged into one section (Case description and management).		2) The case description and case management are merged into a single section (Case Description and Management).
3) There is no need to have an Abstract, but you can have 3 learning points		3) We have removed the abstract section. We have given learning points which we have considered to be adequate.
Handling Editor’s decision	Revisions Required	

Final Editorial Decision (24-May-24)	ACCEPT
---	---------------