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Reviewer’s report:

The authors describe an interesting case series of patients with aggressive axonal polyneuropathy after trauma.

I still have some concerns regarding language editing.

Please indicate at the methods section that there was no further NCS or CSF examination other than the first ones at diagnosis. It would be interesting to see data from these patients even after one year after diagnosis.

Results:

Page 13 first paragraph: please correct ‘fraucture’ to ‘fracture’.

Please add to the discussion a comment on the potential differential diagnoses of GBS after (mostly severe) trauma such as critical illness polyneuropathy. In the reported cases, indeed NCS studies and CSF studies point out towards axonal GBS.

What about the time to treatment initiation for each patient? Did it correlate with a better outcome for some patients?

It would be helpful for the clinician-reader to add a paragraph on the discussion section on possible treatment options in case of post traumatic - axonal GBS. It is generally known that axonal GBS has a poor prognosis compared to demyelinating GBS, patients should be closely monitored for respiratory complications. However, early initiation of aggressive treatment options such as plasmapheresis could probably be more effective than immunoglobulins. Surely prospective studies on axonal GBS evaluating treatment outcome are still needed in the literature.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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