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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a 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?: 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:

MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

It is an interesting article that emphasizes that C. pneumoniae can cause ARDS even in otherwise healthy individuals and that the use of ECMO can be used in such patients as a salvage therapy. However, in the ‘Discussion’ section it is discussed in details only the diagnostic procedures, and briefly the ECMO. The topic of severe C. pneumoniae respiratory infections is hardly discussed. I suggest that the discussion should be enriched with such information (a brief review of the literature).

Also, regarding the diagnosis, I suggest the authors to read the article Vaccine Immunol. 2008; 15:1508-31 and, if they think that adds information, to include it
in the discussion.

MINOR ESSENTIAL REVISIONS

ABSTRACT:
Abstract-Introduction:
Line 2:
Please rephrase the sentence: ‘Infection goes trough…’
Abstract-Conclusion:
-‘Chlamydophilia’ should be changed to ‘Chlamydophila’
-‘Definite diagnosis of Chlamydophilia is uneasy as specific and simple diagnostic tools still need to be developed.’
Please, rephrase this sentence. I would suggest e.g.: ‘Simpler, more rapid and more specific methods for the definite diagnosis of Chlamydophila infections should be developed.’

INTRODUCTION:
-Line 7:
‘…chronic obstructive pulmonary diseases…’ Do you mean ‘…exacerbations of chronic pulmonary disease…’? Please, clarify and add the corresponding reference(s).

CASE REPORT:
General comment:
It should be clear in the description of the case the sequence of the events, using as reference the day of hospital admission (Day 1):
Day of ICU admission, Day of the presentation of acute renal failure, Day of endotracheal intubation and initiation of mechanical ventilation, Day of ECMO initiation, Day of hospital discharge (if available)
-Par. 2, Line 1: ‘sequel’ should be changed to ‘sequela’
-Par. 2, Line 2: ‘gastric ulcus’ I would recommend the use of the term ‘gastric ulcer’
-Par.4, Line 1: ‘aeric bronchogram’ should be changed to ‘air bronchogram’
-Par.6, Line 1: ‘Samples obtained from the day of admission…’ should be changed to ‘Samples obtained on the day of admission…’
-Last par., Line 2: ‘…the patient was extubated a week later…’
Do you mean a week after ECMO withdrawal? Please, clarify.

Discussion:
-Par. 2, Line 4: ‘…diffuse symptomatic course of C. pneumonia …’ Please, rephrase. I would suggest e.g. ‘…unspecific symptoms of C. pneumoniae…’
-Par. 2, Line 4: ‘C. pneumonia’ should be changed to ‘C. pneumoniae’
- General comment: I would suggest an addition of very brief comment on other severe complications of C. pneumoniae that have been reported in the current literature (e.g. acute hepatitis, acute renal failure etc)

Table I:
I would suggest instead using the dates 22/08/2009 - 03/09/2009 - 13/09/2009 presenting the days of sampling as Day 1 - Day 13 - Day 23
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