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27 September 2010

Dear Editorial Team,

Many thanks for your email and for sending our article for peer review. We were very interested to hear the peer reviewer’s comments and we feel we have addressed all of the points they raised and amended our manuscript as they suggested.

In response to reviewer 1’s comments:

The discussion needs some work and has to be focused only on these parts of the case report that are really new. I would suggest to cite the paper "J Trauma 2005; 59:1521-31" and discuss these different compartment of intracranial pressure in relation to the current case report. In addition the discussion has to be shortened.

We have improved the discussion by removing some of the more general points that are not new. We have taken the reviewer’s advice to cite the paper from the journal of trauma and added background information regarding the Monro-Kelly doctrine, including the relevance of this to the imaging findings in our case. The paper from the journal of trauma, has provided an interesting insight to the expanding knowledge in this field and how this may potentially guide management for headache due to spontaneous intracranial hypotension in the future and this was addressed.

In response to reviewer 2’s comments:
1. The abstract section should be improved specially on the case report description.

We have rewritten the abstract to improve its content, in particularly focusing on the case description section.

2. The legends of figure 1 describes a subdural collection and it is not clear, at least to me, in spite of the arrows, that is on the subdural space. Please, revise it with neuroradiologists in order to make sure that it is really a subdural collection.

We have revised the image included with our Neuroradiologist who agreed with the reviewer’s comments. We have submitted a new image for this patient showing clearly her subdural collections.

In addition we have responded to the editorial team’s comments and added the patient’s ethnicity and ensured that our manuscript is formatted in the correct style for the journal. We have also tidied up figure 2, by removing the blurred text around the MR image. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Kind regards

Yours sincerely

Dr Wendy Jones