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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
N/A - no methodology

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
N/A - no experiments or analyses

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
Not sure - I am not able to assess the statistics in this study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
N/A - no results to interpret

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
No - manuscript has some fundamental flaw(s)

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: I think the study is not providing any additional novelty in its main aim. There are different experiences already reported by other groups about adverse events occurring during RTX treatment in SLE patients. In my opinion the spectrum of RTX related adverse events in SLE patients has been already widely debated.
REQUESTED REVISIONS:
I apologize for this comment, but the written English is really difficult to follow. I barely understand the design of the study as well as the result and discussion session. I suggest a profound revision of the English Language and Grammar by a native English speaking colleague before resubmitting the manuscript. I cannot comment on the methodology, results and conclusion without a proper understanding. Happy to review the manuscript again after English Language editing.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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

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

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

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 recommend additional statistical review

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Needs some language corrections before being published
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