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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

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:

Comments on text:

Follow up of case is slightly confusing regarding the time scale: abstract states 8 months post rituximab he is in CR (ABSTRACT; CASE PRESENTATION 2nd paragraph), within the main paper (CASE REPORT last paragraph) it refers to 2 year follow up (which I am assuming includes initial presentation and steroid use; I feel at this point clarification within text of CR at 8 months follow up post rituximab should be made, as it is stated in the abstract.

Figure 1: initial LDH rise post rituximab could be commented on within the text

Minor comments (not for publication)

spellings of oedema, haemolysis, haemaglobinuria, stabilised: clarification
regarding American/English spelling with journal.

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