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Reviewer's report:

Page 5, line 9 - spelling mistake: immune reconstitution syndrome, not immune "reconstruction" syndrome

Page 7, initial CSF result: What was the amount of RBC in the CSF? The reason for this is: could this be a traumatic tap, and hence yielded a positive PCR?

Page 7, line 15 and 16: second CSF result - was culture or PCR sent off again? Has the treating team done investigations to rule out differential diagnosis or to confirm this is IRIS? I understand that the authors included some of these details under "discussion" section, but probably good to insert the details here in the body of the case report.

Given that IRIS was postulated, was adjunctive therapy such as glucocorticoids considered or attempted?

Page 10, line 1 and 2: Our case showed uncountable WBCs at the onset of meningitis and was complicated by brain abscesses =&gt; If authors can kindly clarify this sentence.

MRI images: Kindly add some descriptive texts to guide the readers.

For all the CSF values and leukocytes, please insert reference range as well.

Overall commendable effort in reporting this case report. The table of 14 cases from the literature review is good, however how is the current case different from previous cases? What is novel about this case? What would the authors want the readers to learn from the current case? It will be good if the authors can highlight certain elements of this case report to make it more novel and interesting.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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