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Reviewer's report:

Tahir and colleagues present a well-written description of three cases of post-adrenalectomy hyperkalaemia in patients with AVS-proven primary aldosteronism. A sensible management algorithm is outlined in the figure at the end of the article. However there are a number of points which must be addressed before it can be reconsidered for publication.

Major:

1. The article is far too long. The discussion is 7 pages long and largely repetitive. This is always guaranteed to make the reviewer restless. It should be reduced to 4 pages maximum.

2. I would consider the section on novel agents to target hyperkalaemia in PA largely redundant in the context of the paper and should be removed.

3. The authors need to argue what additional academic value the presentation of their three cases adds to the existing literature on post-adrenalectomy hyperkalaemia in Conn's syndrome.

Minor:

1. Please clarify in the table legend which case it refers to

2. Use consistent terminology - primary aldosteronism v primary hyperaldosteronism

3. I would avoid use of the aldo:renin ratio as this can be misleading - please focus instead on absolute renin and aldosterone values.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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