Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you very much for reviewing our manuscript and offering valuable advice.

We have addressed your comments with point-by-point responses and revised the manuscript accordingly.

Responses to the Comments by the Science editor and Company editor-in-chief

Science editor:

The manuscript has been peer-reviewed, and it's ready for the first decision.

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. Before final acceptance, the author(s) must add a table/figure to the manuscript. There are no restrictions on the figures (color, B/W) and tables. Before final acceptance, when revising the manuscript, the author must supplement and improve the highlights of the latest cutting-edge research results, thereby further improving the content of the manuscript. To this end, authors are advised to apply a new tool, the RCA. RCA is an artificial intelligence technology-based open multidisciplinary citation analysis database. In it, upon obtaining search results from the keywords entered by the author, "Impact Index Per Article" under "Ranked by" should be selected to find the latest highlight articles, which can then be used to further improve an article under preparation/peer-review/revision. Please visit our RCA database for more information at: https://www.referencecitationanalysis.com/.

Reply:

Thank you for your suggestion.

I have added several figures to the manuscript.

Responses to the Comments by the Reviewer 1

Reviewer 1:

Dear Authors, The authors have compiled the subject adequately on a theoretical basis. However, it would be beneficial to support the study with radiological imaging in order for the reader to better understand the subject in the diagnosis part. For example, it needs to be supported by visuals (drawing, MRI or CT images)

for the reader to better understand the concept of DESH, the Evans index, zEI, BVR and Rad Scale. Best regards,

Reply:

Thank you very much for your excellent suggestion.

I have accepted your suggestion and added several figures to the manuscript.

Responses to the Comments by the Reviewer 2

Reviewer 2:

Specific Comments to Authors: Though this paper is well written, unfortunately, this have not been able to afford it a priority adequate for publication.

Reply:

Thank you for your peer review.

I have accepted the suggestions of the editor and reviewer 1 and added several figures to the manuscript.

If you find other improvements, I would be grateful if you could point them out to me.