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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Other

If other, please specify:

Novel use of an existing therapy in an existing (non-responsive) disease.

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:

The authors have reported the use of rituximab to successfully treat a case of auto-antibody mediated haemolytic anaemia not responsive to conventional immunosuppression or plasmapheresis.

The report is concisely written and contains all pertinent data.

I have a couple of minor criticisms.

Table 1 does not add substantially to the report and duplicates some of the data already in the text. The relevant post-rituximab data could easily be summarised
in the text.

There is some inconsistency in reported units; haemoglobin reported as both g/dl (text) and mg% (figure 3) similarly proteinuria is reported as g per day (text) and mg/24 dl (table 1). The more usual units are those in the text and the others should be amended.

The statement "...the possibility of an underlying immunocompromised state were ruled out." is too euphemistic to be clearly understood. If the authors mean the patient was HIV seronegative this should be clearly stated (or whatever the meaning may be).
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