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Author’s response to review: see over

Point by Point response to the Review;

Point 1: Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?
- Variations in disease process by the use of aminaphone

Point 2: Has the case been reported coherently?
- No (the review is right: this is the reason why we have decided to enlarge – also according to the Editor’s comment – the drug aminaphone profile description in the introduction in order to make more coherently the case report description)

Point 3: Is the case report authentic?
- Yes

Point 4: Is the case report ethical?
- Yes

Point 5: Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?
- Yes (also in this case we agree with the review and we introduce in the paper more explanations about aminaphone preclinical and clinical effects, more details on measurements of creatinine clearance as well as blood pressure before, during and after aminaphone treatment – as suggested by the review)

Point 6: Is the case worth reporting?
- No

Point 7: Is the case report persuasive?
- No (we agree with the review but we hope that introducing in the paper more explanations about aminaphone profile and more details about haemodinamic effects observed in the patient before, during and after treatment with aminaphone, the case report will become more persuasive)

Point 8: Does the case report have explanatory value?
- Yes

Point 9: Does the case report have diagnostic value?
- No

Point 10: Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?
No (In this case we disagree with the review because it could be of interest for medical doctors, referring to clinical practice and to clinical management of the patients affected by T1D, understand that the microvascular endothelial control by a safe vascular drug like aminapthone, could postpone T1D nephrologic complications)

**Point 11:** Is the anonymity of the patient protected?
- Yes

**Point 12:** Comments to the Authors:
- The Authors reported a potential effect on albuminuria in the case of a patient with T1D and macroalbuminuria. The drop of albuminuria that was observed after treatment initiation is significant and interesting, and significant is the fact that albuminuria returns to baseline after treatment discontinuation. This is, however, highly suggestive of a haemodinamic effect and measurement of creatinine clearance(or GFR) as well as blood pressure before, during and after treatment should be provided. A English native speaker should review the manuscript.

(According to the review suggestion we have inserted in the manuscript Blood pressure and GFR evaluation before, during and after treatment and have rewritten all the manuscript according to the suggestion of a native English speaker)

**Point 13:** Level of interest:
- An article whose finding are important to those with closely related research interests

**Point 14:** Quality of written English:
- Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited (we agree with the review and we have re-edited the manuscript according to a native English speaker)

**Point 15:** Declaration of competing interests:
- I have no COI to this manuscript: (At the end of the manuscript every of the Authors declare that they have no competing interests; only Marco Bertini, being the medical Department Director of Laboratori Baldacci, has competing interest – Laboratori Baldacci is the Italian Pharmaceutical Company that sell all over the world the drug aminapthone. Nevertheless, as you can see in the Author’s contributions section, He conceived the study, collected the data and helped to draft manuscript: this means that He doesn’t be involved in the patient’s clinical evaluation and on the aminapthone clinical effectiveness. Concluding Marco Bertini has Competing Interest on the manuscript since He is the Medical Department Director of the Pharmaceutical Company that sell aminapthone in Italy and all over the world)