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Reviewer's report:

Dear Authors,

the topic of the manuscript is very interesting, but I suggest some improvements for the manuscript:

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1. The indications for PEDI are not clear. For example: Why do you perform PEDI in Patients with a psoas muscle abscess instead of CT-Guided drainage of the abscess which is much less invasive? What is an "advanced infection with epidural abscess"? Most authors recommend open surgery for removal of an epidural abscess.
2. On what basis were these Pt. chosen for PEDI?
3. Please state how long the patients were planned for follow up? Radiologic parameters should be included in the outcome measures since you report and discuss radiologic changes.
4. The "Odom’s Criteria" are usually chosen for clinical evaluation cervical disc herniations. Maybe you can obtain better Clinical outcome parameters such as SF12 or SF 36 or ODI.
5. What are the results of the clinical examinations? For example did any of the patients have neurological deficits? Or pain upon palpation of the segment?
6. You should discuss the indications and contraindications for the use of Betadine. In Europe, for example, it is only intended for use on the skin and open wounds.
7. Where there any recurrences of the infection?
8. Table 1 needs revision: Please add time of follow up, when were the ODOM criteria obtained?

Minor Essential Revisions:

9. I would suggest to add the Leukocyte (WBC) count to table 2 as well as to the results.

Sincerely

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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