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Reviewer's report:

1. This is a single-center study, which limits the generalization of the results. Thus, the discussion and conclusion of this manuscript should be toned down. Especially, you should revise this sentence "Our study revealed the epidemiology of different autoantibodies in autoimmune encephalitis in a Thai population". I don't think that the data from a single tertiary care center represent the population data. Only multicenter or nationwide data should be considered as the population data. Similarly, the conclusion "we recommend that suspected patients should be screened for both the neuronal surface and intracellular/synaptic vesicle antibodies, regarding any clinical presentation." This expression is too strong.

2. The objective of this study remains unclear, even although the introduction session is a little bit long. I don't agree that "The choice of antibodies to be tested for is based on clinical presentations and the physician's judgement." Considering that the early immune therapy should be considered for better outcome in patients with autoimmune encephalitis, early diagnosis is very important in these patients. The choice of antibodies may make the diagnosis of autoimmune encephalitis delay.

3. I don't understand that the Table 2 is located in the discussion session. You should transfer this table and relevant contents to the result section.

4. How many patients were tested for autoantibodies, and how many patients among them were positive for autoantibody testing? You should describe the inclusion process of the patients in detail.

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.

Unable to assess

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

No

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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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