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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors:

The study is interesting and novel. The anestesiologist point of view in patients with NMDAr encephalitis must be taken into account and I recommend the article publication.

I do have few considerations that I hope will improve the study quality. I consider my comments discretionary revisions except the ones related to Figure 1A, B.

1. Case presentation
   Please explain EEG abnormalities found in both patients and describe seizures with more detail. Do the seizures recurred? The second patients a part of seizures suffered confusion. Was a none convulsive status epilepticus excluded? Were both patients treated with antiepileptic drugs? Was a loading dose of antiepileptic drugs administered during the surgery?

Was the ovarian teratoma confirmed by anatomopathology?

"Patients received gammaglobulins (20g*5 d). It is usual to administrate 400mgr*Kg*day during 5 days. So gammaglobulins dose must be different because patients weight was different.

2. Hyperthermia increases neuronal damage. Did you treat it in the second patient? Please commend in discussion the need to avoid hyperthermia in neurologically ill patients.

3. Figure 1A,B
   In the figure 1A the quality of the EEG trace is poor probably because 50Hz filter is off or because there are a lot of artefact. This quality is not acceptable for publication.

   In both figure 1A and 1B you must add a legend including the filters used (low and high), the voltatge per mm and the seconds per mm. Also you must use the international 10-20 system for electrodes denomination. FB1 does not exist in this system, the correct international term is FP1. The electrocardiogram channel is also important and you do not have to erase it.
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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