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Editorial Team
Journal of Medical Case Reports
We appreciate your comments on our manuscript entitled “Utility of rituximab treatment for Exophthalmos, Myxedema and Osteoarthropathy (EMO) syndrome resistant to corticosteroids due Graves’ disease” by Aldo Ferreira-Hermosillo, Rubén Casados-V, Pedro Paúl-Gaytán and Victoria Mendoza-Zubieta with manuscript number JMCR-D-17-00590. We consider your opinions to be very useful and we have modified the document based on them in order to better explain our case report. We present now the modified paper again for your considerations and also attached our response to your comments.

We expect that these changes (highlighted in the manuscript) will help to better understand our document and that are in agreement to your standards.

In case that there are any more questions or suggestions, we would be glad to answer them.

Kind regards.

Aldo Ferreira-Hermosillo, MD, MSc

Reviewer reports:

Reviewer #1

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

a. The relevant patient information, including:

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

   - Main symptoms of the patient No
   
   - Medical, family and psychosocial history NO
   
   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes Yes

c. The relevant physical examination findings NO

d. 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.
e. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
   - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable
f. Types and mechanism of intervention
g. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: It’s not complete and the duration of treatment and monitoring was not mentioned in details.

Response: We completed clinical information in the main text.

a) Regarding main symptoms, we add that patient presented to Endocrinology Department with severe and painful legs edema accompanied with indurate skin tumors, along with palpebral edema and generalized joint pain that caused difficulty in ambulation.

b) We specify that patient had a family history of gastric cancer and medical history of appendectomy, without any other history of relevance for the case.

c) We highlighted the physical examination of patient at arrive to first consultation to Endocrinology Department.

d) We detailed duration of treatments (including prednisone and methotrexate) and add that clinical improvement was evaluated at 6 and 8 months after rituximab administration.

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

Comments: No

Response: We expect that current change in the case presentation better support its interpretation.

3) Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments: To some extent

Response: We modified the abstract in order to improve its understanding.

4) Additional comments for the author(s)?

Authors presented a case of EMO, which got better with rituximab treatment. But the details of the case evaluations, treatment and follow-up were not mentioned.

Image of osteoarthropy and Exopthalmos would enhance the quality

Need few grammatical corrections

Response: As previously mentioned, we detailed the clinical and treatment information in the text. We decided to add the exophthalmos image before and after treatment with Rituximab to Figure 1 (A) and Figure 2 (A), respectively. We also add a new figure of patient’s X-ray with the changes caused by osteoarthropy (Figure 3). We revised the whole text and corrected orthographic and grammar mistakes.

Reviewer #2

The present case describes a patient with Graves Diseases who developed EMO syndrome. The objective of this manuscript is report this rare extra-thyroid manifestation of GD as well as review current knowledge of its physiopathology and therapeutic options. The authors highlight that the severity of the disease requires a multidisciplinary approach, thus, the interest of this paper is very broad, could help several specialties. The manuscript is well written, clear and very informative. No further comments.

Response: We appreciate the comments of the reviewer.

Reviewer #3

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: Please clarify if an ethical approval (e.g. institutional) was obtained.
Response: Patient gives her written informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. It was not required to submit the case to the institutional ethics committee.

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

Types and mechanism of intervention
Infection status assessment before RTX should be better described (page 4, line 19)
Response: We described infection status evaluation in the “Case presentation” section.

A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits
Comments:
The authors should define time of follow-up after RTX-infusion.
Response: We described time of clinical assessment after RTX-infusion in the case description.

Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments: Percentages in brackets are misleading and could be omitted as they are explained in introduction. Line 7: What do the authors mean be ‘following”? Please clarify. Line 13: ’with' should be replaced with 'and'. Line 12: ‘with' should be replaced with 'to'. Last sentence of abstract should be omitted. Maybe the authors should underscore the Osteoarthropathy, as a manifestation of Grave's disease, which may be treated with RTX, as for this manifestation only scarce information can be found in the literature.
Response: We appreciate for the comments made by the reviewer. The “Abstract section” has been completely corrected. We replace the word “following” with “clinical follow-up”.

Additional comment: We ask you to change the name of the author Ruben F. Casados-Vergara by Rubén Casados-V, in order to have uniformity with his publications.