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Reviewer's report:

Minor Essential Revisions:
Abstract/methods: "...cohort study including patients treated with hypothermia". Were all patients treated with hypothermia. If so state this.

"Criteria for cortical origin ...was epileptic activity" (but there is the caveat that backaveraging was not used - see also comment in authors' Introduction, line 23).

In Conclusions of the abstract where the authors note that the outcome was better than previously reported, was this comparing post hypothermia studies to pre-hypothermia studies (as they note on line 10-11 of the introduction)?

On page 7, results, the authors note that 3 patients made a good recovery but had no reactivity on EEG. This should be commented on in the discussion as it is at variance with the results of Rossetti et al.

Page 7, last line, what does "infaust" mean?

Page 8, line 3, use "proves" instead of "proofs".

"performed at.." rather than "performed on.." Page 8, line 19.

Did patients with stimulus induced periodic discharges have a different outcome?

Page 9, line 14 "benzodiazepines is" rather than "are", as it relates to "treatments...or".

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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