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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The revised manuscript demonstrates improved flow and clarity to the highlighted case. The revisions allow the reader to follow the events which unfolded along with the authors and therefore nicely frames the discussion and conclusion. I think the line on page 4, last revision of the section "case presentation" may be too self-critical; a reasonable alternative may be "...which suggested that the subdural injection of air occurred at the time of attachment o the extension tube filled with anesthetic...." The advocacy of using microbore tubing in lieu of regular volume extension tubing is due to the nature of the injection- one is not necessarily "clumsy," which denotes personal error, but that the needle placement is so precise that microbore tubing theoretically decreases inadvertent needle movement. I would not call the authors clumsy in their approach.
The manuscript I feel is appropriate for publication at this time. The authors may choose to consider the above suggestion for revision.
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