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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Good stuff! Well presented, and nice, clear discussion. The clinical condition is well described in the literature, but is very rare – and the treatment described well. The dramatic turn-around after ART may be co-incidental – you need to acknowledge this, although the timing is fascinating. Biologically, you shouldn’t really see any impact after only a few hours of HAART, and you may want to speculate why you saw this, in a sentence or two, or just make the comment that it seems very rapid and is difficult to explain. You’re adding knowledge to a condition we’re unlikely to have much data on for decades to come.

It’s been described, even though rare. The treatment has not been well described, and the good outcomes suggest this aggressive approach may be
warranted.

Some suggestions:

“Medical Research Council” – explain this rather – not everyone is familiar with the grading. Even if you say “slightly decreased power (MRC 4)” – this is more useful for the non-neurologist.
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