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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor and reviewers,

We want to thank you for your thoughtful and often enthusiastic comments regarding our submitted manuscript. We appreciate the opportunity to respond. We hope that the Editor will be willing to reconsider our manuscript for the publication. All reviewers also had concerns regarding the manuscript. Below, we respond to each comment by the reviewers. In addition, changes and additions to the manuscript are highlighted in red. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Kun Hou

Corresponding author

E-mail: houkunscience@163.com

*Revision Note
Editor comments

1. Question: There is currently insufficient focus in the Discussion on the case you describe and too great a focus on the literature review you conducted. Please ensure that you discuss your case presentation in further detail, frame/contextualize your case presentation in terms of the available literature, and in particular clarify the similarities and differences between your case and those previously reported in the literature.

Response: Thanks for your valuable advice, we have sufficiently considered your suggestion and revised our manuscript accordingly. However, we have to confess that our case was not so different from the similar cases previously reported. In this manuscript we aims to not only present a rare case report but also deduce some general characteristics of DAVF associated CSDH. And we hope this case presentation would provide a broader consideration in the differential diagnosis of SDH.

2. Question: As detailed in the comments from Referee 1 previously, please avoid proposing guidelines or circumstances based on the experience of one rare case and the limited available literature. Therefore, please amend the Diagnosis section of the Discussion (in particular the criteria bullet points) to reflect this. When addressing Comment 1 above, please integrate the Diagnosis section into the similarities between your case presentation and the available literature, and highlight these as possible considerations when deciding on potential clinical approaches.

Response: We have rewritten the discussion section and stated in a more objective way of what we deduce from our case and the literature review.

3. Question: Please re-order the Declarations so as to be consistent with BMC Neurology guidelines.

Response: We have re-order the declarations that is consistent with BMC Neurology.

4. Question: Please remove Figures that are embedded in the manuscript as these are already attached as separate files. Please remove the CARE checklist that is attached to the manuscript, as this was for editorial purposes.

Response: We have removed the Figures and CARE checklist in the revised version.