

Dear reviewers

Thank you for your kindly and suggestive advice. We have made some modification as below.

Best Regard

Xin Yan

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

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

Response: The conclusion has been shortened. We only kept the crucial variables in the abstract and deleted some variables. The grammatical and typographical errors in the manuscript has been edited.

Intro: Pls stick to present tense for general discussion Pls briefly described the mechanism of intracranial hemorrhage after spinal surgery

Response: It had been changed to present tense for general discussion. The mechanism of intracranial hemorrhage after spinal surgery was described in the article.

Methods: The methods section needs to be clearly elaborated and focused

Response: We clearly elaborated and focused on the methods section. We have shortened some part and detailed describe the focused part.

Results: The case presentations need to be shortened. They may be presented in the tabular form for clear understanding.

Response: The case presentations have been shortened. A tubular presentation form was added 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

Response: The purpose of the study had been elaborated clearly. We highlight the mechanism of intracranial bleed after spinal surgery with current evidence in the literature. Specific subheadings has been edited for clearer understanding.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

The authors are discussing very important topic – although rare, it is associated with diagnostic problems and frequently devastating consequences. 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).

Response: This had been modified in the article.

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.

However 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.

Response: It has been shown in the new patient information table (Table 4).

Finally the paper definitively deserves publication but the queries should be answered or at least considered.