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Reviewer's report:

General
This is a well written paper.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

(1) The title and the abstract both state that the focus of the study is on thalamic hemorrhages. However, the aim/objective of the study in the background and methods state that the comparisons between thalamic ICH and ICH over the basal ganglia/internal capsule were the emphasis. The authors should decide on the issue and amend the manuscript throughout accordingly.

(2) Data from ICH over the basal ganglia and internal capsule are also provided. Indeed some the “differences” or “associations” are generated from a comparison between ICH over the two “sites”. If the authors want to focus on thalamic ICH, perhaps they should compare with all non-thalamic ICH.

(3) Predictors of in-hospital mortality are analyzed. Apart from 9 deaths, however, 15 of 47 patients had mRS of 4 and 11 had mRS of 5. These are poor outcomes. The authors should analyze their data to find out the predictors of poor outcome as well.

(4) Discussion is not available over some of the positive findings. There is no discussion on history of chronic liver disease. Dysarthria and aphasia are not separated in the data analysis and discussion.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

The total number of ICH cases should be mentioned in the abstract. As thalamic ICH comprises of 13% of all ICH, it should be “one in 8 patients (not 10 patients)…”.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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