This is an interesting case that deserves publishing after minor revision.

In half a sentence only do we learn that the patient had additional traumatic discus protrusion at C5/6. The authors should discuss the fact that this second injury might pose a danger to the patient during a closed reduction maneuver as well. Therefore, in retrospect, it would have been safer in terms of premanipulation diagnosis to perform both CT and MRI, instead of performing the MRI after closed reduction only. After all, with their way of doing it, reduction was performed without all relevant diagnoses being detected at that time! This needs
to be discussed.

Second, how was the course of the C5/6 injury. This should be included as well.

Third, please add an MRI to the figures showing both injuries.

**Quality of written English:** Needs some language corrections before being published
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