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Author's response to reviews:

Editor Comments:

1. Ethics approval and consent to participate Unless any of the treatments were administered for research purposes, we wouldn't expect a case report to be approved by an ethics committee. Please clarify if any part of your study did require ethical approval, or amend your statement to read "Not applicable" in this section.

Authors’ response: We have added the phrase “Ethics committee approval was not applicable” to the Declarations section (line 173).

2. Authors’ contributions

Please note that based on the current authors’ contributions section, DM and DW do not automatically qualify for authorship. Acquisition of funding, collection of data, writing of the manuscript or general supervision of the research group, alone, does not usually justify authorship.

Authors’ response: A more complete description of the Authors’ contributions appears in the Declarations section, lines 188-191.
3. Clean copy

Please ensure that when you upload your revised submission that it is in the final form for publication. Please remove any tracked changes or highlighting and include only a single clean copy of the manuscript.

Authors' response: The manuscript is in final form.