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Reviewer’s report:

The authors would like to show their way of identification of fistula location in a case of spinal extradural arachnoid cyst. The preoperative detection of fistula location is very important and this method might be helpful. However, there are several concerns before publication.

Major points

1. The authors should proofread the manuscript before submission. For example, the title should not be started by the verb, 'Utilize'. Other than this, there are many errors in syntax, spelling and grammar.

2. How were the results of cine mode of MRI, CISS images and other MRI protocol. There are some papers on how we detect the fistula location.

3. The authors should make a good rationale for the method of 2 needles punctures. In my feeling, this might be helpful. However, there is no good explanation in the text, I think.

The authors correctly describe what are the merit and demerit of this method.

4. Just 3 months follow-up is too short. MRI at 6 or 12 months should be added. There should be reduction of the fluid, compared to that of 3months after Op.

5. There are some cases of spinal extradural arachnoid cyst with multiple fistulas. How do the authors think of the efficacy of this method for such a case?

Minor points

1. Hemostatic matrix, gel: the information of the agents (company etc.) used in this case should be presented.

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.

Unable to assess

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.

Not relevant to this manuscript

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests
I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal