Reviewer #1: **Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good) **Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing) **Conclusion:** Major revision **Specific Comments to Authors:** This case series concern awake craniotomy for auditory brainstem implant in neurofibromatosis type 2 patients. This a very interesting theme. However, recent years have seen many new papers of this field, and this paper adds no important new data to our knowledge and is not acceptable for publication in the present form.

Major points

a) Please clarify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for this treatment.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. Neurofibromatosis type 2 patients who undergoing awake craniotomy and hearing test via the retrosigmoid approach for acoustic neuroma resection and auditory brainstem implant at our institution were enrolled in this study. Patients presenting with severe asthma, severe reduction of mouth opening (<30 mm), obesity (BMI>35 kg/m^2), clinically evident gastroesophageal reflux, or partial airway obstruction of any cause were considered exclusion.

b) In my opinion, the present "case presentation " form should be replaced by the traditional one (separate presentation of each case, or "Materials and Methods" and "Results")

Response: Thank you for your suggestion and these have been corrected in the manuscript.

c) Discussion: Please compare the present study and many representative papers and emphasize the strength of this study.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. It has been compared in the paragraph 2 and 3 of Discussion.

Minor points

a) English: To be revised.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion and these have been corrected in the manuscript.

b) Keywords: delete "case report".

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. However, CARE checklist-2016 reports that 2 to 5 key words that identify diagnoses or interventions in this case report including "case report".

c) References: Too few. Please add many papers published in 2020 and 2021.

Response : Thank you for your suggestion and these have been corrected in the manuscript.

d) Abbreviate the journal's name (refs.8-10)

Response : Thank you for your suggestion and these have been corrected in the manuscript.

e) Figure1: Please indicate the lesion by arrows.

Response : Thank you for your suggestion and these have been corrected in the manuscript.

f) Table 3: Please footnote it ((-):no event).

Response : Thank you for your suggestion and these have been corrected in the manuscript.

Reviewer #2: **Scientific Quality:** Grade B (Very good) **Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing) **Conclusion:** Accept (General priority) **Specific Comments to Authors:** Please add Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate

Response: Thank you so much for your comment. The manuscript has been edited by the editors from AJE, please see attached for the certificate.

EDITORIAL OFFICE'S COMMENTS

Authors must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which are listed below:

(1) Science editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a case report of the awake craniotomy for auditory brainstem implant in patients with neurofibromatosis type 2. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1)

Classification: Grade B and Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The authors reported a very interesting case series concern awake craniotomy for auditory brainstem implant in neurofibromatosis type 2 patients. However, the questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 3 tables and 2 figures. (4) References: A total of 10 references are cited, including no references published in the last 3 years; (5) Self-cited references: There are no self-cited references; and (6) References recommend: The authors have the right to refuse to cite improper references recommended by peer reviewer(s), especially the references published by the peer reviewer(s) themselves. If the authors found the peer reviewer(s) request the authors to cite improper references published by themselves, please send the peer reviewer's ID number to the editorialoffice@wjgnet.com. The Editorial Office will close and remove the peer reviewer from the F6Publishing system immediately. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B and Grade B. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the CARE Checklist–2016 and Written informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by 1 grant. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. 5 Issues raised: (1) The title is too long, and it should be no more than 18 words; (2) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (3) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; (4) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (5) The "Case Presentation" section was not written according to the Guidelines for Manuscript Preparation. Please re-write the "Case Presentation" section, and add the "FINAL DIAGNOSIS", "TREATMENT", and "OUTCOME AND FOLLOW-UP" sections to the main text, according to the Guidelines and Requirements for Manuscript Revision. 6 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion and these have been corrected in the manuscript. There are 16 words in the title. The supportive foundation has concluded, and I have deleted it.

(2) Company editor-in-chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. However, the quality of the English language of the manuscript does not meet the requirements of the journal. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must provide the English Language Certificate issued by a professional English language editing company. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240.**4 LANGUAGE QUALITY**

Please resolve all language issues in the manuscript based on the peer review report. Please be sure to have a native-English speaker edit the manuscript for grammar, sentence structure, word usage, spelling, capitalization, punctuation, format, and general readability, so that the manuscript's language will meet our direct publishing needs.

Response: Thank you for your suggestion. The manuscript has been edited by the editors from AJE. please see attached for the certificate.