

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 85890

Title: Clinical characteristics and risk factors of intracranial hemorrhage after spinal

surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 03999836 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Czech Republic

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-30

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-14 11:33

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-14 12:50

Review time: 1 Hour

	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair
this manuscript	[] Grade D: No creativity or innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [] Anonymous [Y] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors are discussing very important topic – although rare, it is associated with diagnostic problems and frequently devastating consequencies. In all patients the primary surgery was posterior spinal fusion, cerebellar haemorrhages were the prevailing type of intracerebral bleeding and the clinical outcome (maybe better term than "severe prognoses, used in the Abstract). The patients were compared with the randomly selected ones from the large pool of spinal patients. As expected, the studied parameters reflected their advanced age and complicated postoperative course. One parameter is very important – the more frequent presence of spinal dura injury in the group of complicated patients. The cases are well described and point to the grave outcomes in significant percentage of patients. Howevere I would appreciate the notes about the dural injury in each of the case reports, because it seems to be very important (and potentially avoidable) surgery related factor, although the authors discuss it in the Discussion section. Also an information about the position in the cervical stenosis patient (prone or sitting?) is potentially important. Finally the paper definitively deserves publication but the querries should be answered or at least considered.



PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 85890

Title: Clinical characteristics and risk factors of intracranial hemorrhage after spinal

surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05336288 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-30

Reviewer chosen by: Geng-Long Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-06-14 15:19

Reviewer performed review: 2023-06-16 09:27

Review time: 1 Day and 18 Hours

	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C:
Scientific quality	Good
	[] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No creativity or innovation
tillo munuocript	1 Joing D. No creativity of innovation



Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[] Grade A: Excellent [] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [] Grade B: Minor language polishing [Y] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [Y] Major revision [] Rejection
Re-review	[Y]Yes []No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Abstract: Conclusion section is very long. Kindly stick to the crucial variables only Pls rectify the grammatical and typographical errors in the manuscript Intro: Pls stick to present tense for general discussion Pls briefly described the mechanism of intracranial hemorrhage after spinal surgery Methods: The methods section needs to be clearly elaborated and focused Results: The case presentations need to be shortened. They may be presented in the tabular form for clear understanding Discussion: Pls elaborate the purpose of the study The paragraph on the mechanism of intracranial bleed after spinal surgery needs to be move higher up in the discussion section The discussion may be subdivided under specific subheadings for clearer understanding Pls elaborate on the current evidence in the literature on this subject



RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

Manuscript NO: 85890

Title: Clinical characteristics and risk factors of intracranial hemorrhage after spinal

surgery

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 05336288 Position: Peer Reviewer Academic degree: MD

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: United States

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2023-05-30

Reviewer chosen by: Ji-Hong Liu

Reviewer accepted review: 2023-07-03 03:02

Reviewer performed review: 2023-07-03 03:05

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	[] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [] Grade C: Good [] Grade D: Fair [] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority) [] Minor revision [] Major revision [] Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [] Onymous



https://www.wjgnet.com

statements

Conflicts-of-Interest: [] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The recommended changes havebeen made to the manuscript. The manuscript may be accepted in the current form