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Suitable for publication after revision.

Methods

Line 84-89: Please add the reference for your definition of PCC, especially for the 4mm max diameter and for the two vertebral levels extension (shorter cavities can be found more often).

Why the motor evoked potentials were not used during scoliosis surgery?

Results

Line 150: what kind of neurological deficit was present in this patient?

Please provide one or more figures with a typical MRI image of PCC.

Discussion

Please discuss the difference between the PCC and the hydromyelia.

Conclusions

The authors write "Our study indicates there is little evidence". In reality, their study "does not provide any evidence"

Line 273: replace "recommend" with "suggest", (the same in the Abstract)
Legend for tables 1 and 2. Delete the words "The table summarising the". Explain abbreviations AIF, PIF, AR.

Legend for figures 1 and 2. Delete the words "The chart summarising the". Explain abbreviations AIF, PIF, AR.

Legend for figure 3. Another unprecise description. Should better be „Number of patients with normal (green), borderline (amber) or abnormal (red) SCM observed in the study (left) versus the control (right) group.
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