

Reviewer Specific Comments to Authors:

This study titled " Retraction of lumbar disc herniation achieved by noninvasive techniques: A case report" needs major revisions.

Comments:

1- Abstract needs many corrections;

(1) Add clear objectives.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The purpose is added in Abstract section. Please see the Line 68-69.

(2) Methods need more details about the outcome measures.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. Some outcome measures is added. Please see the Line 76-78.

(3) Conclusion should be concise and has to answer the study question.

Response: Conclusion in Abstract is re-written.

2- The introduction section cannot cover all the elements of the study. -

(1) Define LDH in detail.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The definition of LDH was addressed in Line 108-118.

(2) Clarify the significance and importance of the study.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The significance and importance is added in Line 126-131 & 136-144.

(3) Add the objective and hypothesis of the study.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The significance and importance is added in Line 126-131 & 145-149.

3- Methods: - More information are still required about the case reported.

(1) Explain the outcome measure in detail with validity and reliability (add references).

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The outcome measure is added in Line 172-173.

(2) Treatment: discuss manipulation, acupuncture, in details (areas, positions, time, frequency, intensity, and applications) .

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The manipulation and acupuncture is added in Line 193-200.

(3) The three-dimensional (balanced regulating), the authors only mentioned the steps without details of the procedure. Also, add references.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The three-dimensional (balanced regulating) is added in Line 200-220.

4- Discussion:

(1) The introductory paragraph should demonstrate the main findings of the study.

Response: We would like to thank the reviewer for the valuable suggestion. The main findings of the study is added in Line 248-253.

(2) The findings should be compared with previous or related studies.

Response: The comparison between previous or related studies and methods involved in this study is added in Line 254-279.

(3) Implications of the study should be explained.

Response: Implications of the study is added in Line 287-300.

(4) The limitations of the study should be demonstrated.

Response: Implications of the study is added in Line 320-325.

Company editor-in-chief

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, 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.