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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Other

If other, please specify:

unexpected extreme late complication and difficult follow up treatment

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?: Yes

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 authors now added important information to the paper. Especially the images now are sufficient to illustrate this complicated case.

Still for me it is not adequate to simply state in the abstract:

"We performed a dorso-ventral instrumented spondylodesis and at a follow-up of 12 months the patient is free of complaints. " for a postoperative course which resulted in at least 2 to 3 months of therapies and a patient who nearly died due to a therapy for "pain in her lower back with
paraesthesia in both her legs but otherwise no neurological symptoms".
I still think that the abstract has to mention the severe complications!
With this change I would suggest this paper for publication.
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