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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:

Interesting and unusual case which reminds one that Group B Streptococcus is a serious pathogen.

The report is too succinct and would benefit from some elaboration, both in the case report per se and in the discussion.

Specifically, would add details of the patient's prenatal history, including whether prenatal GBS screening was done and would add a sentence on the health status of the infant she delivered.

The timeline of the case presentation is unclear and would specify time elapsed throughout.
In the case presentation, pertinent negatives should be added to the physical examination. Absence of murmur, pelvic examination, absence of embolic phenomena, etc.

Normal ranges should be added to the table of laboratory values.

Details of the "extensive autoimmune, microbiological, and haematologic work-up" should be added. Numbers of negative blood cultures, serologic markers, etc should be specified.

GBS is S. agalactiae (minor typo).

In the abstract and discussion, the authors comment that her presentation could have been interpreted as consistent with SLE (in which case her endocarditis could have been erroneously felt to be marantic). However, it is not clear that SLE was considered prospectively. If it was, this should be stated.

I presume that the authors suspect the episotomy was the source of the infection, but this is not mentioned.

Do the authors feel there is a role for GBS screening?

The Figure should have key anatomic landmarks and the vegetation labelled to orient the reader.
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