

Reviewers Comments	Authors' Response	Page no. of change.
1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? ANSWER: Yes. I only consider it necessary to add at the end of the title. "Case Report"	The same has been added as advised.	(P1) line 3
2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? ANSWER: It requires to be added, and must be structured, with the following parts: ABSTRACT BACKGROUND CASE SUMMARY CONCLUSION	A structured abstract has been added as advised.	(P1) line 8-27
3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? ANSWER: Authors must add keywords.	Key words have been added in the manuscript file.	(P1) line 5-6
4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? ANSWER: The introduction is short, concise and well written, and does not require subtitles. I suggest that the authors delete the subtitles: Etiology of Syringomyelia, and Challenges in Current Treatments. Only the last paragraph structures it better, and it can be as follows: "We present the case of a patient with post-arachnoiditis syringomyelia who was treated surgically by reconstituting CSF flow without passing through the adhesion zone, using tecotecal bypass. This new technique, its safety and clinical efficacy are described in detail."	The subtitles in the introduction have been deleted and the last paragraph modified as advised.	(P2) line 48-51
5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? ANSWER: This does not apply as it is a case report manuscript.	-	-
6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? ANSWER: This does not apply as it is a case report manuscript. What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? ANSWER: The contribution is that the tecotecal bypass is an innovative alternative to treat POST-ARACHNOIDITIS SYRINGOMYELIA	-	-
7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically? ANSWER: Yes. Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? ANSWER: Yes. Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently? ANSWER: Yes. Although the main reason being the report of a case with a novel surgical technique as treatment, this aspect is the main limitation.	-	-
8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? ANSWER: Yes. But they must be presented in the manuscript after the References. Do figures require labelling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? ANSWER: Yes. I only suggest to the authors of the manuscript that they erase at the bottom of all the figures: "Original image"	The images and legends have been moved to after the References. The words "original image" have been deleted from the figure legends as advised.	P11-16
9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? ANSWER: This does not apply as it is a case report manuscript.	-	-
10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of	-	-

<p>use of SI units? ANSWER: Yes.</p> <p>11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? ANSWER: Yes.</p> <p>Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? ANSWER: Not.</p> <p>In relation to the References I have several observations about the embedding in the body of the manuscript and in its writing in the respective section:</p> <p>1. Reference numbers must be embedded in the body of the manuscript as superscripts and in square brackets [1].</p> <p>2. In the second paragraph of the Introduction Reference 8, I suggest the authors include it immediately from: Gottschalk et al. As superscripts and in square brackets [8].</p> <p>3. The journal requires that the references be written like this, example Reference 1: Greitz D. Unraveling the riddle of syringomyelia. Neurosurg Rev 2006;29(4):51-63; discussion 264. [PMID: 16752160 DOI: 10.1007/s10143-006-0029-5] List all authors, deleting the period (.) between the abbreviated name of the journal and the year of publication, after of the volume and number of the journal, write down the pages. In addition to the DOI, before this add the PMID.</p> <p>4. Reference 7 is a publication that is periodically updated on the Internet and should be written as follows: Shenoy VS, Sampath R. Syringomyelia. StatPearls [Internet]. StatPearls Publishing, Treasure Island (FL). Last Update: June 29, 2021. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK537110/</p>	<p>Changes have been made as advised.</p> <p>Changes have been made as advised.</p> <p>Citation styles have been modified as advised.</p> <p>The citation has been changed as advised.</p>	<p>(P2) line 43</p> <p>P8-10</p> <p>(P9) line 243-245</p>
<p>12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation.</p> <p>Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? ANSWER: Not. Authors are required to make the aforementioned improvements and suggestions.</p> <p>Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? ANSWER: Yes.</p>	<p>The aforementioned corrections have been made as advised.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>13 Research methods and reporting.</p> <p>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? ANSWER: The authors incompletely used CARE Checklist - 2016. In the previous answers are the actions to be taken to improve the manuscript by the authors.</p>	<p>All the aforementioned corrections have been made as advised.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>14 Ethics statements.</p>	<p>-</p>	<p>-</p>

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? ANSWER: The authors present the signed informed consent.

Manuscript Peer-Review Specific Comments To Authors:*
Please make your specific comments/suggestions to authors based on the above-listed criteria checklist for new manuscript peer-review and the below-listed criteria for comments on writing. The criteria for writing comments include the following three features: First, what are the original findings of this manuscript? ANSWER: In this case report manuscript, the authors, based on a clinical case, propose a novel surgical technique as a treatment.

What are the new hypotheses that this study proposed? ANSWER: This does not apply as it is a case report manuscript.

What are the new phenomena that were found through experiments in this study? ANSWER: This does not apply as it is a case report manuscript.

What are the hypotheses that were confirmed through experiments in this study? ANSWER: This does not apply as it is a case report manuscript.

Second, what are the quality and importance of this manuscript? ANSWER: Its quality is acceptable, which can be improved by carrying out the actions mentioned by the authors. The importance lies in the proposal of the use of a new surgical technique for the treatment of POSTARACHNOIDITIS SYRINGOMYELIA.

What are the new findings of this study? ANSWER: That the evolution of the patient was satisfactory in the medium term.

What are the new concepts that this study proposes? ANSWER: The principles of the proposed new surgical technique have consistent physiological bases.

What are the new methods that this study proposed? ANSWER: To carry out future additional controlled studies, with a significant volume of patients to evaluate the evolution with the surgical technique used, in addition to minimally invasive techniques in spinal surgery, in addition to the use of prefabricated perforated tubes, and the percutaneous insertion of intrathecal tubes.

Do the conclusions appropriately summarize the data that this study provided? ANSWER: Yes.

What are the unique insights that this study presented? ANSWER: The use of a new theco-thecal bypass surgical technique for the treatment of postarachnoiditis syringomyelia.

What are the key problems in this field that this study has solved? ANSWER: Have another alternative surgical treatment for postarachnoiditis syringomyelia.

Third, what are the limitations of the study and its findings? ANSWER: The authors acknowledge the need for larger randomized control studies with a longer follow-up period

<p>before theco-thecal bypass procedure can be established as a regular treatment for postaracnoiditis syringomyelia.</p> <p>What are the future directions of the topic described in this manuscript? ANSWER: To carry out future additional controlled studies, with a significant volume of patients to evaluate the evolution with the surgical technique used, in addition to minimally invasive techniques in spinal surgery, in addition to the use of prefabricated perforated tubes, and the percutaneous insertion of intrathecal tubes.</p> <p>What are the questions/issues that remain to be solved? ANSWER: If, by conducting additional controlled studies, with a significant volume of patients and with longer-term evaluation, the theco-thecal bypass procedure is safe and effective in improving the anatomical abnormalities of syringomyelia and all the symptoms and signs that patients presented prior to surgery.</p> <p>What are the questions that this study prompts for the authors to do next? ANSWER: Defining the safety and efficacy of the theco-thecal bypass procedure.</p> <p>How might this publication impact basic science and/or clinical practice? ANSWER: Future use as the surgical technique of choice for the treatment of patients with postarachnoiditis syringomyelia.</p>		
--	--	--

Editorial Office's comments and suggestions:

<p>(1) Science editor:</p> <p>Congratulations on presenting this interesting technique. Kindly refer to the Reviewer's comments and address them as appropriate. Language improvements needed. Consent from patient to publish needs to be mentioned. Discussion can cite more similar cases or similar techniques reported.</p> <p>Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing) Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)</p>	<p>Mention of the patient's consent for publication has been added.</p> <p>The manuscript has been analyzed and corrected using professional language editing software, as advised.</p> <p>To the best of our knowledge, this is a novel procedure and no similar techniques have been reported in literature for the treatment of post-arachnoiditis syringomyelia.</p>	<p>(P3) line 77</p>
---	--	---------------------

(2) 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 Surgical Procedures, 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. 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.

The original images have been uploaded during the submission. Images have been reprocessed using PowerPoint as requested.

-