Reviewer's report

Title: Subcutaneous implant with etonogestrel (Implanon(R)) for catamenial exacerbations in a patient with cystic fibrosis: a case report

Version: 2  Date: 27 April 2014

Reviewer: Sanjay Chotirmall

Reviewer's report:

This manuscript by Lamas et al describes an interesting case of a CF female with catamenial exacerbations that illustrated an excellent clinical response to hormonal manipulation therapy. I think this case is an extremely interesting and fascinating one and illustrates in practice the effects if hormonal influences on CF clinical disease in particular patient subsets. Studies from our group have indicated that there may exist an important ‘hormonal responsive’ CF group and this case is evidence of this. I also think the figure provided is excellent. While I think the authors do need to revise and have the paper edited by a native English speaker including significant improvements to spelling, grammar and sentence structure throughout to improve readability, I do believe that this case should be published in BMC Pulmonary Medicine as it adds significantly to the CF literature and improves our understanding of the hormonal factors that are at play in CF disease. I have placed some comments for the authors to consider below;

Major Comments

1. Abstract: I think the conclusion needs to be re-worded to “The potential of treatment directed at hormonal manipulation such as that with oral contraceptives or subcutaneous implants should be considered in suitable cases”

2. The graph summarizing the patients clinical course and treatment is excellent but I would suggest if the authors are agreeable the use of colour coding for ease of identifying patterns for the reader

3. As the patients genotype was not your usual expected, could the class of mutation play a role in hormonal responsive CF disease? The authors should discuss this in the discussion portion of the manuscript

4. I think the discussion (particularly in the early portion) is rather confusing to read and needs again to be re-written by a native English speaker in order to clearly communicate to the reader the points (which are valuable) that the authors are attempting to make

5. The authors should hypothesize in the discussion the roles of estrogen versus progesterone in CF and additionally the differences between endogenous and exogenous estrogen? – This should be an additional new paragraph in the revised manuscript

Minor Comments

1. Subcutaneous catheter should be re-worded as “porta-cath”
2. Spelling ‘hypophysis’
3. Spelling ‘studying’
4. Spelling ‘pattern’

**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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