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**Reviewer's report:**

The authors have addressed the main points of criticism although many points could not be fully addressed due to the retrospective data available. This has been discussed by the authors. Minor changes need to be done concerning the conclusion (see below).

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   
   Yes

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   
   Yes

3. Are the data sound?
   
   Yes

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   
   Yes

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?

   The conclusion should be edited. The authors write that an incidence of hydrocephalus of 3% was found. However, given the fact that several patients did not receive imaging (especially 7/8 patients who died during acute meningitis), they should add a note to the conclusion that this may have been underestimated.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

   Yes, in the text of the manuscript but not in the conclusion section (but see comment on Conclusion).

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

   Yes.
8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes. However, abstract not available for review.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes.
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