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Author's response to reviews:

Response to reviewer's comments:

Reviewer 2 made one general comment/ suggestion:

"I propose to the authors that they take the background and put it in place of the Abstract. And please indicate to them that the present abstract should be converted to the background and the references properly inserted into the new background".

She also drafted a replacement abstract based on the background and case presentation sections of the article.

Collectively all three authors had some difficulty in figuring out the reasoning behind this suggested change. In drafting the article we strove as far as possible to comply with the journal style and noted that the abstracts of case reports are invariably short and succinct with minimal background and generally leaving the more technical aspects of the case presentation for the main body of the article. To comply with the suggested change would mean that significant contents of the Case Presentation and Conclusions sections would end up in the 'Background' section of the article since these are currently part of the Abstract.

We have however substantially revised the abstract in the spirit of the reviewer's suggestion. The background section (of the abstract) now refers to the association between HUS and antibiotics, which formed a large part of the reasoning behind submitting the case for publication. We have also revised the case presentation section of the abstract, removing much of the technical detail and incorporating one sentence from the reviewer’s proposed paragraph. The case presentation section also now mentions the absence of typical HUS symptoms which is picked up in the Conclusion section of the abstract.

We feel that the abstract now stands alone (which we believe was the desired intention of the reviewer) in that it summarises all the key information of the case, whilst at the same time conforming to the journal style.