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Reviewer's report:

Page 5- first line in methods should read "decompression" not "depression"

Page 6- sixth line same error

Page 9- States that "none of them achieved ambulatory status." Is this referring to non ambulatory patients? This needs to be clarified as it contradicts the preceding sentence.

Page 9- "84.8% 28/33) of ambulatory patients maintained their neurological status, whereas 15.2%

(5/33) of ambulatory patients before surgery lost their ability to walk for disease progression (4 patients), and one patient died within 4 weeks." is a bit more clear than the existing sentence

Page 11- First paragraph should not end with an exclamation point

Page 11- last sentence should read something like "Aside from the Rades score, the above mentioned..."

Page 12- first word "were" should be removed

Excellent overall paper and one that I think is needed in the literature. It was a pleasure to review.

A couple of other questions:

1. Ambulatory status serves as a proxy measure for motor function. Was there a difference in survival for patients who were intact versus with a mild motor deficit (E versus D)?

2. Profound motor deficits present for 14 days are unlikely to recover well. Is there a recommended timing for operation based on your data review?

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

**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.

Yes

**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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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