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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This is an interesting case report, though not significantly novel in terms of clinical reporting, pathogenesis, therapeutics or diagnostic testing. Pasteurella does cause severe invasive disease and as a gram negative organism does elicit responses associated with endotoxemic shock. Therefore, this report does not add significantly to the literature.

The abstract is poorly written. Statements such as "successfully treated with antibiotics" are extremely vague and should not appear in the abstract.

When suspecting an unusual clinical course for an organism, one thinks about host factors and immunosuppression. The underlying possibilities in this 82 year old woman are manifold and have not been addressed (nutritional state, steroid use for COPD, etc). The lab data are not clearly presented. Also, was there a
differential diagnosis and what other conditions might one think of in this setting?

In general, the case report is very scant.
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