

Peer Review File

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/jss-21-109>

Reviewer A

Comment 1. Line 301: The first mJoa should be changed to mJOA.

Reply to Comment 1. Updated.

Comment 2. Table 1: Please confirm the accuracy of the JOA Score "...from 0-1, 7". Should it be revised into "from 0-17"?

Reply to Comment 2. Yes, this has been corrected.

Reviewer B

The manuscript is well written and the tables provide excellent summaries of the data. The manuscript would benefit from the addition of some details, mainly in the Methods.

Comment 1. What was considered a "walking outcome measure" (pg. 6 lines 152-153)? Would a measure like the mini-BESTest, which includes walking tasks, be considered a walking outcome measure? How was the construct of walking defined for this review?

Reply to Comment 1. The "walking outcome measure" that were included in this study comprise of assessment tools both subjective or objective assessment tools that were used clinically. These include subjective tools such as the JOA score and Nurick grade and objective tools such as the 30m walk test.

Comment 2. Pg. 6 line 166: Please include a summary of the Inclusion and exclusion criteria. For example, were self-report measures included? Biomechanical measurements? Were studies that included individuals with other non-traumatic or traumatic spinal damage, in addition to individuals with DCM, included?

Reply to Comment 2. Inclusion criteria is listed from lines 143-153. Yes, self-reported measures were included (this is listed in line 153). Only studies assessing DCM were included (line 148).

Comment 3. Figure 1: Typically, the reasons for full-text exclusion (with n) are listed.

Reply to Comment 3. Unfortunately, we don't have the full list of reasons for the 104 studies that were excluded at the full text stage.