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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear editor, Dear reviewers,

We take this opportunity to sincerely thank you for your comments that help us to significantly improve our manuscript. Please find below a point by point response to all reviewer’s points.

Reviewer 1:

1) Abstract: We changed the title page abstract to correspond to page 3 abstract

2) Introduction:

a. Page 4 line 72: We reformulate the sentence to be clearer (Background section lines 79-80 page 4)

b. Considering including data from Europe: We used the references that you provided to us and formal reports from the French poison centre to incorporate European data (background line 76-80 page 4)
c. Are the authors limiting studies to those with blood concentrations of nicotine and cotinine? We didn’t limit our research to studies with known blood concentration of nicotine and PG, but we limited the comparison of the different case reports to those with the same route of injection as ours (background lines 95-99 page 5)

References included:


d. Comment on paediatric literature: As our case is an adult voluntary intoxication we decided not to discuss all of the pediatric cases described in the literature because of the different route of administration, the different pathophysiological changes in the pediatric population and the majority of minor intoxications in the pediatric population. However to support the general consideration we used the references that were given for the general considerations in this population (background lines 91-93 page 4)

References included:


3) Case report

a. How the patient was confirmed to have nicotine poisoning and what prompted us to carry out cotinine and nicotine measurements: We clarified in the text that the patient had explained the precise amount of product that he used, the site of injection and showed us the product and the material that was used. We also stated that we ruled out a concomitant intoxication and explained more clearly that we performed nicotine and cotinine dosage to objectively prove the intoxication. (Case report lines 111-112 page 5 and case report lines 156-159 page 7)
4) Ethics approval
   a. An informed consent signed by the patient was asked for before submission, which has been added in our submission (annex).

Reviewer 2:

1) Precision about local reaction at the site of injection: Our patient didn’t have any local reaction at the injection site. This precision has been added to our manuscript (case-report lines 116-117 page 5)

2) Did the patient experience any arrhythmias: We described short runs of atrial tachycardia but no other sustained atrial or ventricular arrhythmias were noted during monitoring. (case report lines 144-145 page 7)

Reviewer 3:

1) Time to presentation after attempting suicide: This information was already in the original manuscript and has not been modified. (case report line 108 page 5)

2) Time from injection to signs and symptoms: This information was already in the original manuscript and in the timeline figure and has not been modified. (case report page 5-7)

3) Provide the vital signs at arrival to Emergency: We added the vital signs as suggested in our manuscript case report. (case report lines 112-114 page 5)

4) Explain the previous history of smoking: The patient was a previous smoker (conventional cigarettes). (case report line 106 page 5)
5) Was the actual product used by the patient available for further assessment: We add this precision in the manuscript. We didn’t do any further tests on the product because we could find an independent report about purity, nicotine concentration and adjuvants provided by the company. (case report line 113 page 5 and lines 157-158 page 7)

6) How the patient was confirmed to have nicotine poisoning: We clarified in the manuscript that the patient explained the precise amount of product that he used, the site of injection and showed us the product and the material that was used. We also precised that we ruled out a co-intoxication and explain more clearly that we performed nicotine and cotinine dosing to objectively prove the intoxication. (case report line 113 page 5 and lines 157-159 page 7)

7) Compare studies from table 1 to the present case: We created a new paragraph to compare the different studies as requested. Therefore, there are few similarities with the other cases of injections. We decided not to compare our case with the paediatric population and intoxication by different routes of administration because of the different pharmacokinetics of the products depending the route of administration and the different physiology in children. (discussion subsection 1 lines 166-172 + table 1)

8) Ethics approval: An informed consent signed by the patient was asked for before submission, which has been added in our submission.

9) Limitations: We describe the limitation of our case report in the discussion. (discussion lines 257-260 page 11)

10) References: We improved our references and integrated some references suggested by the reviewers. (references lines 310-375 pages 13-16)
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