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Reviewer’s report:

Major:
- the authors should clearly state what they think is unusual with their case – see last paragraph of the introduction
- it is quite possible that some T. brucei rhodesiense strains are sensitive to pentamidine. It is, therefore, not totally surprising that the patient was successfully treated with this drug. Besides, pentamidine is the only trypanosomicidal drug that is available outside specialised centres. The most important topic to be discussed with this case is whether or not HAT (rhodesiense) should promptly be treated with pentamidine if other drugs cannot be obtained immediately.
- I assume that the treatment was started without knowing the species of this HAT. The authors say that molecular genetic species differentiation was done from pre-treatment whole blood samples. When was this performed, at what day of treatment or was the species ascertained retrospectively? In Uganda, both types circulate.
- What would have been the strategy if the drug did not work – without knowing the species. The authors did not discuss their therapeutic approach at all. It would be nice to provide an overview on previous cases treated with pentamidine
- Resistance could be established by mutations in the P2 transporter, encoded by the TbAT1 gene. Have the authors assessed the parasites genotype (afterwards)?
- the manuscript should be shortened significantly. The paper / discussion should focus on what is added to current knowledge by this particular case

Minor:
- it is good that the disease was treated successfully. But this alone does not justify a case report. Suggest to highlight the information of particular interest in the title.
- 6 figures for one single case report appears to be too much. Suggest to include some as supplemental material or to combine the figure / fotos as a-d for example
- I do not think that figure 6 adds significant information on what has already been described in the text. Suggest to work on the figure / include further details
and shorten the text or leave the figure out (and still shorten the text). See also table 1

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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