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Reviewer's report:

The authors have outlined a case study reporting the transition from subcutaneous treprostinil to oral selexipag while the patient was on background therapy with an ERA and 2 PDE5 inhibitors. This patient with severe IPAH at the time diagnosis had been commenced on upfront triple therapy but became intolerant of subcutaneous treprostinil.

This case study is informative and is interesting and may add weight to future prospective studies addressing whether transitioning patients from subcut therapy to po therapy is feasible, nevertheless the poor quality of written English makes it very difficult to follow.

Furthermore I'm not aware of the evidence for combining 2 PDE5 inhibitors for additive effects as was performed here. Has this patient been continued on dual PDE5 therapy as well as ERA and selexipag? The authors comment in the Case Presentation paragraph (Line 53) that initially they replaced treprostinil with sildenafil 60mgs, however it was not 'replaced' but rather added to facilitate reduction of treprostinil. Prior to the removal of treprostinil the patient was on 5 vasoactive drugs for her PAH. How was her systemic BP during this period? Is it conceivable that the addition of sildenafil was the most important treatment to enable weaning off treprostinil? Perhaps unlikely, but should be mentioned. In the discussion paragraph you need to outline more clearly what was measured in the serum that was similar between treprostinil and selexipag groups. What model was used? Was this a head to head dosing study?

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

Unable to assess

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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