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Reviewer's report:

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.
2. In Statistical analysis, there are two parentheses at: SPSS 16.0 (( SPSS Inc.Chicago, IL). One of the opening parentheses should be 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.
4. Why did you use ICP Probe monitoring only in 42 patients, and not in all the patients of the study?
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. Eventhough table 1 seems to be clear.
   I strongly suggest to review this paragraph and clarify.
6. Line 206: instead of "So patients may experience intracranial..." I suggest to exchange 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.
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