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Which of the following 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?: 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:

This is a case report that details an extremely unusual clinical presentation of mild head trauma. The authors have described the clinical setting adequately. They have hypothesized the mechanism of the spinal cord necrosis but could have elaborated the pathophysiology with respect to the vascular territory involved e.g.: anterior versus posterior spinal artery territory or pial versus sulcal artery involvement. They could have used the autopsy findings (gross and microscopy) to advance the hypothesis.

Figure 2 showing the autopsy specimen should be labelled indicating the orientation. In addition an axial section at the region of the abnormality will be interesting to the readers.
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