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**Author’s response to reviews:**

Dear editor and reviewers,

We want to thank you for your thoughtful and often enthusiastic comments regarding our submitted manuscript. We appreciate the opportunity to respond. We hope that the Editor will be willing to reconsider our manuscript for the publication. All reviewers also had concerns regarding the manuscript. Below, we respond to each comment by the reviewers. In addition, changes and additions to the manuscript are highlighted in red. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Kun Hou

---

*Revision Note*

**Editor comments**

1. Question: Please ensure that the interpretation of the results in the Abstract and Discussion sections acknowledges that your study pertains to a single case, and its associated limitations,
and refrain from drawing conclusions that are not supported by the single-case data-set. Please also see reviewer 1's comments in this regard.

Response: Thanks for your valuable advice, we have sufficiently considered your suggestion and revised our manuscript accordingly. We stressed the limitation of our study.

2. Question: Please ensure that the case report remains the primary focus of the manuscript, with the literature review providing a background context for your study.

Response: Yes, the present study mainly focused on a rare case of CSDH secondary to DAVF. The review of literature was to investigate the background context behind this rare entity.

3. Question: Please remove the references to 'systematic review' in the manuscript, including the abstracts. Systematic reviews are stand-alone article types which typically require more detailed methodologies than that employed in your manuscript. Please refer to your approach as simply a literature review.

Response: We have removed the expression of “systematic review” in the abstract and context.

4. Question: Please provide high-resolution figures and attach these to the manuscript. Please also ensure that no patient identifiable information is present in these figures.

Response: High-resolution figures will be uploaded in the manuscript submission system and would also be attached at the end of the manuscript.

Reviewer 1

1. Question: Katharina Busl (Reviewer 1): I continue to have concerns with recommendations for approach to diagnosis and care that are made based on a single experience - the authors should state much more clearly that this would be the recommendation of a personal approach, but cannot defend the idea to propose guidelines or circumstances based on the experience of one rare case.

Response: Thanks for your careful review of our manuscript. We have revised our manuscript according to your suggestion and further explained the limitations of this study.
Reviewer 2

1. Question: This is an interesting and novel case report. The study is technically sound and clearly presented. The background review of the literature is very helpful.

Response: Thanks for your careful review and thoughtful and enthusiastic comment on our manuscript. Hopefully, this rare case report and literature review would benefit the readers.