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Reviewer’s report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1. As the study is described only one sample is analyzed for the presence of hLAMP2 antibodies. I would like the authors to provide data for the other samples as well. As long as this data is not provided it is not possible to speculate in any additional value of the anti-hLAMP2 ab. Thus, I would like anti-hLAMP2 ab included in Table 1.

2. The authors conclude that the patient probably don’t have anti-GBM nephritis but instead SVV. I agree, but from this conclusion to say that the anti-hLAMP2 antibodies “strongly support this hypothesis” is not logical. There is no evidence in the manuscript that substantiates this notion and should be rephrased both in the abstract and the conclusions.

Minor Essential Revisions

3. On page 4, first paragraph, 4th row: It is unclear how many biopsies that were taken and when. On row 3 there is a first biopsy taken and on row 4 there is a second but both are described as if they where taken at the same time.

Discretionary Revisions

4. How was the anti-GBM antibodies measured? It is written that anti-alpha3(IV) antibodies where measured and found positive but in fact most commercially available kits contains all alpha-chains. Could this perhaps be the reason for finding anti-GBM antibodies that obviously do not bind to the GBM? Can the patient have antibodies against the alpha1(IV) chain and not the alpha3(IV) chain as reported elsewhere?
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