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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Presentations, diagnoses and/or management of new and emerging diseases

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?: Yes

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?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The authors submit a case report of H pittmanie clinical infection in a patient with chronic fibrotic lung disease. They give an excellent description of the methods used to identify the pathogen, and convincingly prove that H pittmanie was the organism in question. However, they need to develop the clinical scenario more to demonstrate that the organism was responsible for the clinical presentation, and not merely an innocent colonizer in the setting of structurally damaged lungs.

1. Did the patient have cystic fibrosis or siderosis? In the case scenario, siderosis is described, but in the discussion, the authors make numerous references to cystic fibrosis. Please clarify.
2. Are CT or CXR images available for inclusion? If images are not included, the authors at least need to mention whether there were infiltrates or other new findings on radiographs to suggest pulmonary infection.

3. The clinical history should be more developed in the manuscript. What symptoms was the patient having? What was the tempo of the illness? Was there productive sputum? On presentation, what were the physical findings? What was the temperature (mentioned only that he had fever)? What was his peripheral WBC count? Was there any other organ dysfunction?

4. Were other causes of respiratory decompensation excluded? Did he have a respiratory virus panel performed? What other studies were done to evaluate cause of worsening?

5. Was the H pittmaniae isolated from an expectorated sputum, induced sputum, bronchoscopy specimen, etc? Were there any epithelial cells in the specimen?
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