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Response to reviewer’s comments:

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you very much for revising our manuscript entitled “Acute bilateral mass-occupying lesions in non-penetrating traumatic brain injury”. We have revised our manuscript and marked the changes in red words according to the comments from reviewers point-by-point.

With best regards!

Sincerely yours,

Chaohua Yang

October 15 2014
Reviewer's report:

Reviewer: Benoit Herbert

Major compulsory revision

The methods section of the abstract need to be re-written to match the quality of the methods section of the manuscript: the number of patients included belongs in the results, inclusion/exclusion criteria as well as all the outcome measures that you used need to appear.

Answer: Thank you very much for your advice. The methods section of the abstract has been re-written.

Minor essential revision

Some spelling mistakes

Answer: Sorry for our mistake and carelessness. We have revised the whole manuscript and corrected some misspelling.

Reviewer: Juan C Quispe

Minor essential revisions:

1. Abstract: Methods: (16 # age # 70) is not clear. Do you mean from 16 years old to 70 years old?; then it would 16 # to # 70 years old. Because what we have between the parentheses is everybody younger than 70, otherwise you should delete 16. The same occurs in Patients and Methods.

Answer: Thank you very much for your suggestion. “(16≤age≤70 years)” has been changed to “aged from 16 to 70 years”.

2. In Statistical analysis, there are two parentheses at: SPSS 16.0 (( SPSS Inc.Chicago, IL). One of the opening parentheses should be deleted.

Answer: Sorry for our mistake and carelessness. One of parentheses has been deleted.

3. In the Treatment paragraph: I would suggest to mention Table 1. That way the reader can see the whole picture, before going forward reading the paper.

Answer: Thank you for your advice. Table 1 has been mentioned in the Treatment paragraph.

4. Why did you use ICP Probe monitoring only in 42 patients, and not in all the patients of the study?

Answer: According to Guidelines for the management of severe traumatic brain injury, mounting
evidence supported the use of ICP monitoring in severe TBI patients with an abnormal computed
tomography (CT) scan. Although ICP monitoring is helpful in severe TBI patients at risk for
intracranial hypertension, ICP monitoring has direct costs and thus not all patients can afford the
medical care in China.

5. Results: Upon admission: “The pupillary reflexes were missing in one patient. Then, lines 133
-134 says: “In bilateral surgical group, patients were more likely presented with bilateral absence
of pupillary response”. Do you mean that the after admission, the number of patients with absence
pupillary reflex, increased? It is a little confusing. Even though table 1 seems to be clear. I
strongly suggest to review this paragraph and clarify.

Answer: Sorry again for our mistake and carelessness. We want to express that data of pupillary
reactivity was not available in one patient. As table 1 have showed the information clearly, we
have just deleted the sentence.

6. Line 206: instead of "So patients may experience intracranial..." I suggest to exchange to "Then
patients may experience intracranial..."

Answer: Thank you. “So patients may experience intracranial...” has been changed to “Then
patients may experience intracranial...”

Methods:

I suggest to the Authors to mention that there were three groups of treatment: Conservative,
Surgical Unilateral and Surgical Bilateral. The rationale is that as a reader, this allows a better
understanding of the methods as well as the results.

Answer: Thank you. The three groups of treatment have been revised as your suggestion.