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Reviewer’s report:

This manuscript describes a retrospective analysis of 27 patients admitted for methotrexate poisoning. The goal of this paper was to compare signs and symptoms, complications, treatment and final outcomes of acute versus chronic methotrexate poisoning. This is an interesting study as being able to differentiate between presentation and treatment in acute and chronic poisoning may provide insight into both populations, including eventual changes in the suggestions for treatment or understanding outcomes. This manuscript should be revised for flow and some additional technical writing. I would like the authors to expand on what the ultimate goals of the research will be and what they hope the data will be used for in the future.

Abstract:

Page 2 Line 29: The first and second groups have not been defined yet. Consider referring to them as acute and chronic here.

Page 2 Line 26: Are the authors recommending additional treatment?

Introduction:

Page 3 Line 35: Is there a reference to the second to last sentence. Ultimately, will this work be able to suggest more aggressive treatment?

Methods:

Page 4 Line 33: Was the self-made questionnaire filled out as part of standard of care?

Results:

I would recommend including a demographics table. A table showing difference in treatment may also be helpful as this is part of the ultimate conclusions of the manuscript.

Page 5 Line 19: Please define how total dose was calculated.
Page 5 Line 48: This sentence and others may benefit from reorganization. Consider discussing complaints in a similar structure to that in the article with PMID 30146743.

Discussion:

I would recommend reformatting this section to be what was observed and why the results do or do not align with what is known from the current literature. The Limitations section, particularly the need for better definitions of acute versus chronic methotrexate poisoning, may deserve more attention in the Discussion.

Conclusion:

The difficulties of differentiating between chronic and acute methotrexate poisoning should be brought up in the discussion, introduction, and/or possibly methods section. I would like a clearer statement on what this work contributes to the field as whole. How do the last two statements fit in to the work described in this manuscript?

Table 1: I recommend staying consistent and reporting means only. There is an asterisk after pH on the bottom line. I did see further explanation near the table. Please include statistical test information hear and Table 2 as well.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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