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Reviewer's report:

This case report is of great interest for the clinicians dedicated to the care of patients with tuberculosis and specially to those focused on epidemiology of such disease. This is a good manuscript, however, I think it needs a review of the way in which it is written. For instance, the background in the abstract is not very informative about the epidemiology of tuberculous meningitis globally and the current state of the presentation of CNS tuberculosis in the context of gestation. Instead of, the authors are stating that even when the incidence of this disease is declining over time, they could found a case in a pregnant woman thanks to the availability of MRI, so, if they did not have such technology they would not be able to diagnose tuberculosis?

In the case presentation of the abstract I suggest to describe the last part of it as follows:

Instead of: Brain magnetic resonance imaging showed multiple intracerebral tuberculomas, chest radiography normal finding, while Koch's bacillus was isolated only from urine cultures. On long-term follow up, she was cured with no sequelae and got two girls after two years of treatment.

Write it as: "Although findings on chest radiography were normal brain magnetic resonance imaging showed multiple intracerebral tuberculomas and Koch’s bacillus was isolated from urine cultures. On long-term follow up after delivery, she was cured with no sequelae and become pregnant again without any additional complication."

I suggest to use more specific key words, i.e.: tuberculous meningitis, pregnancy.

L8: I suggest to add that some of the clinical signs of SNC tuberculosis are subacute and some of them might be confused with presentation of other diseases related with pregnancy such as pre-eclampsia, hyperemesis, brain tumors and even epilepsy during gestation. Also, authors should include a short introduction to the case.

L21: "unemployed"

L5-8 of the 5th page: "The differential diagnosis….. is low", do not mention it, just simply describe the case
which revealed no pathological findings, ultrasound of abdomen was normal, …

she got pregnant again by IVF…

last few years occurred around 900 cases annually…

I do not have comments regarding the discussion.

Conclusions are poor written and do not reflect the importance of the case findings to the management of pregnant women with neurological signs.

Images of brain MRI in figure 1 are of poor quality. Although there is no an enhancement of the meninges at the base of the brain, it is clear that in addition to the parenchymal tuberculoma there is also certain degree of brain edema, augmented subarachnoid space and ischemia at left parietal lobe suggesting meningoencephalitis compared with brain MRI in figure 2. So, be careful with the form in which you are describing and classifying the patient, since along all the manuscript you are assuming tuberculoma and meningitis as the same clinical entity. I think that you should describe the case as a patient with tuberculoma accompanied with acute meningoencephalitis, or simply as a case of central nervous system tuberculosis. Therefore, even title of the case report must be reconsidered.

Table 1 is not mandatory to appear in the manuscript.
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