

Reviewer comments and Answers

Round-1:

J Gubensek

Review Date: 2020-10-24 16:50

Reviewer Specific Comments To Authors: The authors present two siblings, infected with COVID-19, in whom the outcome was the opposite of what was expected. While the cases(s) presented are interesting by itself, the manuscript is not written very clearly/fluently.

Answer: It has been re- written according the manuscript guidelines and the CARE Check list requirements

Reviewer Remarks: - core tip: "if they are somehow "protected" from the infection ", since dialysis patients are not protected from the infection itself, this should be changed to something like ""protected" from the severe forms of infection"

Answer: It has been changed : it is not yet clear if they are more or less vulnerable to the severe disease.

Reviewer -introduction: "These patients suffer from intense pro-inflammation, where hyper-cytokemia predominates (3)" - although this was a theory in initial phases of epidemic, it is now becoming clear, that cytokine levels are only mildly elevated (see doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.17052). Also the levels in ref 3 are <100, usually levels >100-500 are considered for cytokine removal therapy. Please revise.

Reviewer - authors talk about "cytokine storm" in one of the patients, but no IL-6 was measured. Perhaps this could be changed to "severe form of disease" or MOF or at least "presumed cytokine storm" –

Answer: We agree. It has been revised. No cytokine storm mentioned

Reviewer discussion: it should be shortened (a total 2000 W for a case report is too much). Please only discuss findings that are important for the specific (two) cases.

Reviewer - discussion: When references are quoted, too much unnecessary details are given - please just cite the main result/argument from the cited study, without full description of all findings.

Answer: We agree. It has been shortened to 581 words. Only important findings mentioned

Reviewer - discussion: "immunoabsorption with specialized filters" - this fact should already be given in the case report. I suggest the exact device and company (Oxiris?) is given. Also this is usually not considered "immunoabsorption", which refers to specialised apheresis procedures.

Answer: We agree. It moved to the case report. It was hemoabsorption. All the necessary details stated. "On May 15, he was also offered a 2 hour duration hemoabsorption-session with haemoabsorber HA-330 (Jafron, Adsorbent material Styrene divinylbenzene copolymers) as per ICU

protocol. HA-330 filters are used as “salvage therapy” in critically ill septic patients with multiorgan failure (renal failure included)”.

Reviewer - could the authors stress the factors in either of siblings that were identified as negative prognostic signs? (older age, obesity, dialysis dependance, ...) This would make comparison more straightforward

Answer: We agree. This point of view (clinical and laboratory prognostic factors) are presented now in discussion.

Reviewer -reference 8 - this is a preprint (article, that is not yet peer reviewed) - I would suggest the citation of an already published article, e.g. PMID: 33062496 or 32924707

Answer: The reference 8 was removed. The one suggested was added.

Round-2:

Reviewer The case report was greatly improved and reads much more fluently. the Figure 1 is referenced but is missing (either it was omitted and should be deleted from the text, or it should be upoloaded with the manuscript).

Answer: Figure 1 was not found probably beacause it was uploaded in the “Audio core top” upload file, since another option for uploading power point (as asked) was not found. This time it will be sent to the editor and BPG editorial office by email. Also it will be included in the manuscript at the end, before the table.