Dear Editor,

Thank you very much. I have studied the review opinions and made relevant modifications according to them.

I revised it one by one according to the modification suggestions.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: The manuscript is well written and I recommend acceptance.

Answer: Thank you very much for your review. No specific amendments were proposed.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Thank you for your submission. Your manuscript was an interesting read. But the manuscript is not well organized and does not follow a clear flow. Please see the following comments about how your data could be further clarified: • According to the title of the manuscript, there is no useful and appropriate explanation in this regard in the introduction section. • Most of the explanations in the introduction lacked references.

Answer. Thank you very much for your review. I have added the corresponding content in the introduction section and added the corresponding literature citations.

In part (Minimally invasive neuroendoscopic surgery positioning and

techniques), the authors have not specified according to which technique or reference the points A, B, C, and D have been measured. Does the technique used have no specific reference?

Answer. Thank you very much for your review. In this article, my main purpose is to recommend this surgical measurement method that we have studied by ourselves and promote this technology, which can achieve the purpose of surgery in a minimally invasive manner.

Specific and useful information is not provided in the results section. It is not clear what the result of this study was. These presented materials are not related to the results section.

Answer. Thank you for your review. I added further content to the results section. My results section was originally organized to highlight the accuracy, minimally invasive and practical value of this surgical method.

Most of the parts and materials presented in the discussion section have no references. • There is no reference from lines 119 to 136. • There is no reference from lines 139 to 167. • Most importantly, based on what results, such discussions have been raised? •

Answer. Thank you very much for your review. I have added the corresponding content in the introduction section and added the corresponding literature citations.

The explanations of CT scan and MRI in the case presentation section do not have scientific explanations. CT scan images, MRI, and histology images are mentioned in the draft, but none of these images are uploaded in the manuscript. •

Answer. Thank you very much for your review. In fact, the purpose of this article is to use CT technology to complete the minimally invasive localization of surgery. Instead of studying CT or MRI technology itself, I uploaded pictures from the system, which were not

in the manuscript, and I corrected them.

Most of the parts and materials presented in the discussion section have no references. There is no reference from lines 119 to 136. There is no reference from lines 139 to 167. Most importantly, based on what results, such discussions have been raised?

Answer. Thank you very much for your review. I have added the corresponding content in the introduction section and added the corresponding literature citations. The final result of this paper is to confirm and popularize the feasibility and accuracy of CT localization surgical incision determination method.