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Author's response to reviews: see over
On behalf of my co-authors I would like to thank you for your reply concerning our manuscript, entitled “Membranous Nephropathy and Lupus like syndrome after Haematopoietic Cell Transplantation: A Case Report and Literature Review”.

We have carefully considered the concerns raised by the editorial office and have responded to each comment accordingly. Changes in the revised manuscript are indicated in red characters.

**Point-by-point answer to the editorial office comments.**

"I would agree that this case report is interesting, but I think that it needs some major revisions before we can accept it. The revisions are not about the content, but more how the content has been presented. We are the Journal of Medical Case Reports and so our focus is on Case reports. In terms of the case they report, fine, I can accept that this may well be a 'first' and so am happy to accept the manuscript just on the case report alone.

However, the addition of a literature review means that we then move from the conventions of what is accepted as the 'method' and reporting format for case reports to what the accepted methods are for literature reviews. Their literature review is reported in a very limited fashion and so it is hard to know how methodologically sound their review is. Also I would concur with one of the peer reviewers (Dr Doyle) that it does not make sense to use any statistics in a review of cases.

So I suggest the following options."
a) revise the manuscript and OMIT all mention of the literature review. If this were done then the manuscript will be ACCEPTED.

b) revise the manuscript but change the following aspects of it that refer to the literature review

- the focus of the manuscript must be on the case and the literature review must be a secondary pursuit which the authors have undertaken to put into context their case (i.e. how typical is their case compared to what they have found out from other cases in the literature and what have they learnt from comparing their case to the cases in the literature).

- do not use statistics in the literature review

- provide more methodological information on how the case review was carried out. I realise they may not wish to put this in the text of the case report, but they can always provide this as an appendix or online file.

In addition, please remove the dates of treatment from the case presentation section in order to protect the patient's identity.

Response: We opted to omit all mention of the literature review. All changes are provided in red marks. We also provide a clear version without any marks. Dates were also removed.

We trust that this revised version now meets with your approval.

Assuring you of our best attention at all times,

Dr Kostas Stylianou

Consultant Nephrologist