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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a case report concerning a patient with Parkinson's disease (PD) accompanied with camptocormia and Pisa syndrome for whom spinal cord stimulation (SCS) resulted in pain reduction and improvement of both camptocormia and Pisa syndrome.

I find this case report of interest as it adds to the information concerning the use of SCS in PD. SCS is widely in use for a number of pain conditions, based on numerous publications including quite a few large randomized multi-centre studies corroborating the usefulness in the major well established indications. For PD, however, only a few publications exist and a recent review article on the subject (ref 6 in this manuscript) lists only 8 published studies comprising 24 patients in total. I have been unable to retrieve the article (in Japanese) that I presume the authors mean when stating that "Spinal cord stimulation (SCS) has recently been reported to be effective for truncal postural abnormalities such as camptocormia and Pisa syndrome in Parkinson's disease" (ref 3 in the manuscript). Perhaps the authors can provide further insight on how to retrieve this article as it does not show up neither on Medline nor on Google Scholar when I search for it. In my mind a reference in a scientific article must be retrievable to the readers to be of any use and should be left out if that is not the case.

I do, however, feel that the manuscript needs revision. In particular, I find the general conclusion hard to accept. The patient being presented is said to have benefited from DBS with reduction of camptocormia and Pisa syndrome for a period exceeding one year, before that beneficial effect waned off. Yet the present case report only outlines results from SCS for up to 29 days after SCS insertion. The follow up period is very short and the obvious conclusion in my mind Is that both longer follow-up and more patients treated are necessary to validate SCS as a treatment option in the present setting. The authors have provided a CARE checklist, but they have not incorporated the CARE outline in the outline of their article, which I think they should have done, to improve legibility. The discussion section is too long and could be shortened substantially. On the other hand, the case presentation can be improved, with much more specific information on the treatment given to the patient.
I would like to add a few more specific comments:

1) Title: Please add "case report" to the title as stated in the CARE checklist.

2) Case presentation: Please add more information on the DBS performed: what target, what stimulation parameters, what implants. What effect on other symptoms of PD?

3) Case presentation: what spinal nerve was subject to radiofrequency coagulation?

4) Case presentation: Please start the report on SCS with the trial period. For how long was the trial SCS used? With what kind of equipment? Settings? Concerning the implanted SCS please provide more information: Where was the pulse generator implanted. What settings were used for stimulation and when was stimulation started? Did the patient control the stimulation himself? Did the patient use continuous stimulation or did he stimulate when he wanted to. Did the stimulation yield paresthesias or was it subthreshold. If paresthesias were present where did the patient locate them? Was the final electrode location chosen based on paresthesia spread or on some other information? Was DBS discontinued or present during the SCS period? If present was DBS altered or unaltered?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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