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Reviewer’s report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: No

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

a. The relevant patient information, including:

- De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)

- Main symptoms of the patient

- Medical, family and psychosocial history

- Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

b. The relevant physical examination findings

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.
d. Diagnostic assessments, including:

- Diagnostic methods
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments:

- In case 1, It is not clear when the initial blood cultures were drawn and when the second set were drawn. (lines 79 - 83)

- Line 76: suggest revision to say echo did not reveal any vegetation or other sequelae of IE rather than ruled out

- Line 89: Is the drug regimen correct? the drugs and respective durations seem to have been juxtaposed

- Case 2: no mention of any CSF studies are made

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: see below

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: Yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: Yes

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

- the WHO guidance re treatment for Neurobrucellosis usually recommends 3 drug regimen. can the authors comment on the treatment used in their cases

- Line 133: minor changes in blood counts are common, especially low WBC or platelet count along with coagulation deficiencies. authors may need to update their references to more recent date publications (reference 9)

- Line 130: authors state the bacterium was shown to have crossed the BBB but do not give any proof of CSF analysis in case 2.

- Line 228: References are out of sequence (7 before 6)

- Need to acknowledge prior publication of these 2 cases (Suarez-Esquivel M et al, PMID: 28518028)

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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