

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

I am writing to thank you and the anonymous reviewers for concerning my manuscript entitled “Cerebral corridor creator for resection of trigone ventricular tumors: Two case reports and review of literature” (ID:70251 case report).

I am much encouraged by the reviewers’ positive recognition of my manuscript as conveyed in your email. Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving my paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. I have studied comments carefully and have made correction which hoping meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper are as flowing:

Reviewer #1:

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
3. Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes
4. Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Yes
5. Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Yes
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? Yes
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
8. Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Yes. Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? No
9. Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? NA
10. Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? NA
11. References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Yes. Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? No
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? Needs correction

Response: we have carefully revised the manuscript according to your comments and also have re-scrutinized to improve the language and grammar by a biomedical editing company (MedE Editing Group) according to your advice.” We also provide a language editing certificate to verify the language of the manuscript has reached grade A.

13. Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, 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. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? Yes
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? Yes

Comment: Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Response: we have uploaded all figures in a PowerPoint file named “70251-Image File” and all graphs or arrows can be reprocessed by the editor.

Finally, when I submit the automatically generated manuscript file, there is always some Garbled code like “+ADw-html+AD4APA-p+AD4-”.I can’t deal with it, so I also upload my revised manuscript in the supplementary material with all the revised details together.

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.