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Reviewer's report:

I have only very minor comments that could improve the manuscript if followed by the authors:

The most "important" is on the part of the discussion on S100B from Line 22 Page 16 to the end of the discussion. The authors should state in one sentence that the increase in S100B reported in SNT and brain trauma can be viewed with little doubt as an attempt of the body to counteract apoptosis. This will help the reader who is not a specialist in this field to better that the further increase of S100B by HBO is beneficial and do not oppose the reversing effects of HBO of SNT-induced changes in some of the other markers studied by the authors. Alternatively, the authors cite a work by Chazalviel and colleagues published in Med Gas Res. The authors should further cite another work by Chazalviel and colleagues published in Brain - which better explains one way by which HBO could provide neuroprotection - or replace one by another.

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.

I am able to assess the statistics
**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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