

Answering Reviewers

1. Comments: First, this work is not a case study nor it is a case series. Therefore I advise to change the title as follows: Cluster Headache Due to Structural Lesions – a Systematic Review of Published Cases.
Answers: We have changed the title to “Cluster Headache Due to Structural Lesions – a Systematic Review of Published Cases”, please check it in Page 1.
2. Comments: In the same sense also the abstract should be adjusted. Moreover, the abstract should be condensed.
Answers: We have adjusted and condensed the abstract, please check it in Page 2.
3. Comments: Second, this review would certainly be ameliorated if the authors would choose to describe the details of the literature research performed according to the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) checklist (Moher, Liberati, Tetzlaff, Altman, & Group, 2009).
Answers: We have read the PRISMA 2009 Checklist, and the manuscript was prepared and revised according to the PRISMA 2009 Checklist.
4. Comments: The results of prior (systematic) reviews should be cited and discussed in detail in the discussion section.
Answers: We have added discussion of the results of prior reviews, please check it in Page 7 Line 12-17, 23-24; Page 8 Line 18-20, 24-26.
5. Comments: The period of assessment (1988 to March 2018) should be extended up to this day.
Answers: We have extended the period of assessment to January 2021, please check it in Page 3-4.
6. Comments: In Figure 1 the terms “papers” and “cases” are confounded. In each box it should read: ... papers (... cases).
Answers: We have revised the figure according to the suggestion, please check it in Figure 1.
7. Comments: Third, grammar, spelling as well as style and choice of vocabulary have to be improved. For instance, instead of “... it must be stressed that the response to CH treatment is not informative (page 8).” it might read: “... is not a sufficiently reliable criterion to discriminate between CH and CLH.” Another example, instead of “Indeed, how can we obtain the most benefit for patients, when considering accuracy and relatively low cost (page 3)?” it might read: “... obtain the most benefit for patients, i.e. achieve high diagnostic standards at comparably low cost?” Third example: “Here, we review the literature ... (page 3)” In my opinion the use of past tense (simple past) would be more appropriate. Furtherly, instead of “presented CLH as the initial main symptom (page 4)” it should read “CLH presented as the initial main symptom”. Another example: Beneath the “Results” section there is a subheading “Pathologies”. I would like to recommend to change this subheading into “Anatomical correlates of CLH”. On page 5 there are two brackets side by side: (6.1%) (23 case 1 and 2, 33,

40). Better: (6.1%; 23, case 1 and 2, 33, 40). Page 7: “Mainardi F explained”. Better: “Mainardi et al. (2020) explained”. Page 9: “neuroimaging may be normal“. Better: „neuroimaging results may be normal“.

Answers: We have revised all the language errors, please check it in Page 9 Line 1-2; Page 3 Line 16-17; Figure 1, Page 4 Line 6-7, Line 13; Page 4 Line 6; Page 8 Line 3; Page 8 Line 24-25; Page 10 Line 13.