

Oct 29, 2021

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 71747-review.doc).

Title: Lumbar disc sequestration mimicking a tumor: Report of four cases and a literature review

Author: Sheng-Tang Li, Tao Zhang, Xue-Wen Shi, Hua Liu, Cheng-Wei Yang, Ping Zhen, Song-Kai Li

Name of Journal: World Journal of Clinical Cases

ESPS Manuscript NO: 71747

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1. Format has been updated.
2. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

The first reviewer

1. Background: no information is given about the symptoms associated with this condition, how is the diagnosis can be performed, and the radiological appearance.

Re: Thank you for the useful comments to improve the paper. Relevant information has been supplemented in the text.

2. Case presentation: Page 4 line 133: "After conservative treatment": which therapy was given? Based on the clinical symptoms why hernia was not the suspected diagnosis in the first place? and why no differential diagnosis was performed?

Re: Specific conservative treatment method has been supplemented in the text. Because the preoperative diagnosis of lumbar disc herniation mainly depends on the patient's clinical manifestation, laboratory examination and imaging examination, but this patient is atypical, and it is difficult to distinguish from spinal tumor in imaging examination. We also made

differential diagnosis before operation, but we still consider the possibility of spinal tumor, so it is diagnosed as spinal tumor.

3. P10 Line 274: "reviewed 23 literature reports ". When a review is performed it is mandatory to write which database was used (PUBMED?EMBASE?), form which year to which year was the review performed and the keywords used for the search.

Re: Relevant information has been supplemented in the text.

4. The author should add the strengths and limits of this manuscript and the future direction of the topic.

Re: It has been supplemented in the text.

The second reviewer

1. Abstract: It is better to mention the pathological findings for each case too.

Re: Thank you for the useful comments to improve the paper. Relevant information has been supplemented in the text.

2. While writing the case, in my opinion, it is better to complete the detail of a case (history, examination, investigations, and management) and switch to other case.

Re: We have tried to modify it, but we have written and uploaded each case according to the requirements of the magazine, so it may not be able to present it completely.

3. To compare and contrast among the case you can later tabulate the key features of the cases.

Re: The table has been made and presented in present case 1, case 2, case 3 and case 4 of Table 1, it is convenient to compare our 4 cases with the previous study of others.

4. Please consider rewriting reference 25 (issue / volume missing).

Re: After using the endnote document editor, we worked very hard to find the issue and volume of this reference, but we didn't find it in the end, so I'm very sorry.

The science editor

This case report presents four cases of disc herniation mimicking a tumor. And suggest that examinations and tests should be improved preoperatively. Patients should undergo comprehensive preoperative evaluations, and the lesions should be removed surgically and confirmed by pathological diagnosis. These recommendations help distinguish between disc herniation mimicking and spinal tumor.

Re: Thank you for the useful comments to improve the paper.

The company editor-in-chief

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. Authors are required to provide standard three-line tables, that is, only the top line, bottom line, and column line are displayed, while other table lines are hidden. The contents of each cell in the table should conform to the editing specifications, and the lines of each row or column of the table should be aligned. Do not use carriage returns or spaces to replace lines or vertical lines and do not segment cell content. Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Re: The pptx version of the original picture has been uploaded, the table has been modified as required, and the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy has been uploaded.

Thank you again for the useful comments to improve the paper.

Yours sincerely,

Song-Kai Li, MD,

Department of Spine Surgery, The 940th Hospital of Joint Logistics Support force of Chinese People's Liberation Army, No.333 Nanbinhe Road, Lanzhou 730050, Gansu Province, China. lisongkai@gmail.com

RE-REVIEW REPORT OF REVISED MANUSCRIPT

Name of journal: *World Journal of Clinical Cases*

Manuscript NO: 71747

Title: Lumbar disc sequestration mimicking a tumor: Report of four cases and a literature review

Provenance and peer review: Unsolicited Manuscript; Externally peer reviewed

Peer-review model: Single blind

Reviewer's code: 06130469

Position: Peer Reviewer

Academic degree: Doctor

Professional title: Doctor

Reviewer's Country/Territory: Italy

Author's Country/Territory: China

Manuscript submission date: 2021-09-20

Reviewer chosen by: Yan-Xia Xing

Reviewer accepted review: 2022-01-10 19:54

Reviewer performed review: 2022-01-10 20:17

Review time: 1 Hour

Scientific quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept (High priority) <input type="checkbox"/> Accept (General priority) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection
Peer-reviewer	Peer-Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous <input type="checkbox"/> Onymous

statements

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

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In my previous review, I noticed that no information is given about the symptoms associated with this condition, in this new manuscript I don't find them too. Especially in case report it is mandatory to describe each case in a complete way. I've noticed that in the text the conservative treatment used for each patient are still absent- Additionally in the discussion, a table describing the differential diagnosis should be added, including the radiological appearance and the clinical signs and symptoms and risk factor for each disease. Strengths and limits of the manuscript and the data regarding the review performed have been added clearly. New revisions are highly required.