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Reviewer's report:

General

Myasthenia gravis in pregnancy. Course of 18 cases and their products

This paper reports 18 patients with myasthenia gravis during pregnancy and immediately after birth and from Mexico City. The study is retrospective and covers 7 years. It is not clear whether all patients during that time period have been included or if there has been any selection. Data from 18 MG patients are interesting and worth while a scientific report.

There are a couple of weaknesses in this study. Retrospective data are less reliable and detailed than prospective. Acetylcholine receptor antibody status for the patients is not known. A problem using drug dose as a clinical parameter during pregnancy is that a reason for reduction or change in drugs may be fear of teratogenic effects, not a change in clinical severity. It would therefore have been interesting to know the change in clinical severity and the change in drug dose separately. It is claimed in the results that “all the patients were stable before pregnancy”. It has not been mentioned how this was examined and defined, and for how long time the clinical situation was stable.

There are quite a lot of writing errors in this manuscript. There are some inconsistencies in abbreviations. For two of the authors, their institutional address is lacking. Newborn babies are called “products”. Length of pregnancy is repeatedly given by a number but without any denomination (should be weeks). Batochi is a female (not “he”). In reference 11 the first name letter is missing for Evoli (should be A). In reference 15, first and middle names are used in stead of surnames (should be Hoff JM, Daltevit AK, Gilhus NE).

The information in all the tables is a repeat of information also given in the text. This information should be given only once in the paper, either as tables or as text.

This study is of sufficient importance and originality to merit a separate publication. It is to my best knowledge neither duplicate nor redundant publication. However, a few major questions should be clarified and also a thorough revision of language, figures, abbreviations and nominations should be undertaken before final publication.

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Accept after minor essential revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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

Statistical review: No
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