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Reviewer's report:

like previously I told, it could be useful for young Neurologists and Neurosurgeons if it would be presented in a different manner. See all my new comments

1) Beside the fact that Authors are still not describing in a simply a clear way what is really Paradoxical herniation, and why it can occur, in my previous revision there was all the "essential" matter of this argument:

"The pathophysiology of paradoxical herniation has been postulated to be secondary to a large craniectomy defect exposing the intracranial contents to the external positive atmospheric pressure. This may cause also CSF disease, including post-traumatic hydrocephalus."

The Authors could report this brief description

2) If the Authors may realize this concept, they should be aware that a Lumbar Puncture is always an hazard in these circumstances, and not the solution like They were thinking when They performed LP in their patients.

Infact, with the reduction in intracranial pressure, the intracranial contents deviate under a pressure gradient away from the site of craniectomy, and this is the motive for which CSF drainage procedures are uncommonly performed, especially Lumbar Puncture.

Why the Authors are not enhancing this concept from the beginning of the discussion?

The Authors are describing in the Discussion the utility of a Blood patch, like in the cases of CSF Hypotension, without remembering that the first therapy for hydrocephalus from cranial decompression is Cranioplasty.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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