Reviewer's report

Title: Minimal change nephrotic syndrome in an 82 year old patient following a tetanus-diptheria-poliomyelitis-vaccination

Version: 2 Date: 28 April 2009

Reviewer: Joan Robinson

Reviewer's report:

The authors have done a good job of addressing the concerns of 4 reviewers. Table 1 is now an excellent table. Some of the new sentences require better proof-reading. I would still like to see the following changes:

Major compulsory revisions:

The method of searching the literature would fit better in the methods section rather than in the discussion. The results of this search belongs in the results section. It is also acceptable to just casually mention previous cases in the discussion and provide a table, but I would prefer to see it done more formally since it is such an important part of the paper. I would like to see a brief summary of the five cases rather than a detailed description of only one of the cases as currently appears on Page 6.

Page 6 – last paragraph – It is not clear to me why you discuss the rash. I know this relates to a comment from another reviewer, but you need to explain it more (i.e. point out why you do not think the rash and nephrotic syndrome are allergic

Minor essential revisions:

First line of abstract and of introduction – The most common cause of idiopathic…

Page 4 – Line 7 – should be “The chest radiograph showed no signs of…

Page 4 – last paragraph “After minimal change nephrotic syndrome was confirmed by biopsy…and an ACE-inhibitor…? Omit second sentence as third sentence confirms the proteinuria improved.

Page 6 – Discussion – second paragraph – line 4 ? Instead of “so far”, say “to date” and clarify if you are including your own case

Page 7 – line 6 –not sure what you mean by “the different of the vaccines to induce an immune response” Do you think differences could relate to the type of vaccine (live versus killed, whole cell versus component vaccines)?

Page 7 – mid-page – should be 17-year-old girl
-“steroid sensible” should be “steroid-sensitive”
-sentence with the relative incidence of 1.52 – sentence needs to be made into a complete sentence – should supply confidence interval for this relative incidence

Page 7 – for necrotizing glomerulonephritis, the “G” does not need a capital

Page 7 – last full sentence on the page – not clear what you mean – There is no proof that vaccinations cause relapses – to date there is just an association.

Page 8 – first full sentence on this page – incomplete sentence

Page 8 – “influences” is spelt incorrectly

Discretionary revisions:
none

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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