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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This study on endoscope evacuation for treating intraventricular hemorrhage is very interesting and will be very helpful in neurosurgery. Few studies are available in the literature on endoscopic surgery for IVH compared with conventional EVD surgery. The sample size is larger in this present study when comparing IVH arms of other studies. Outcome variables are similar to the studies available in the literature. If we consider the hematoma clearance rate as an endpoint, then the power of this present study is pretty high. The methodology is well written. Kruskal-Wallis test was performed instead of Mann-Whitney U test which is acceptable. I appreciate this work. This is technically sound.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The cited references should be up to date within recent 5 years.
2. Please detail described any complications in this endoscopic procedure.