

REVIEWER 1 and 3 have accepted it

REVIEWER 2

Discussion is too long and unfocused. Discussion needs to be focused and organized and the citation of the existing literature will need to be concise in an organized manner.

The discussion has been significantly modified. It has also been organized although not separated in sections. However, it follows a reasonable flow between general concepts about Gem and its mechanism of action, then gemcitabine induced HUS with general data regarding frequency, diagnosis and challenges that make this difficult, treatment which is very controversial, and complications.

We think it would be now much easier to follow.

Also the references have been organized and the length of this part of the article (discussion) has been reduced to make it more concise and focused.

REVIEWER 4

The authors should explain how this case report adds in the existing literature. As I understand the only novelty is that this is the first case of gemcitabine induced HUS with cardiovascular system involvement at the time of diagnosis. So add this in the abstract.

Explained this part and included in the abstract

The findings of the urine microscopy should be reported.

This detail has been included on page 6 in red colour.

“Older literature reviews indicate it is more frequent when the patient is in remission or has minimal tumour burden reference”. You forgot the reference

This has been modified to make it clear and it is included in red on page 9. The references are added.

“Subsequent interventions include have also being used such as steroids...” Please edit

This has been edited and it can be seen on page 10 in red colour.

“Ustwani et al have reported resolution of the haemolysis and thrombocytopenia in four patients with gemcitabine-induced HUS.” Please add after ecolizumab treatment (or move the sentence to the previous paragraph).

This sentence has been edited and moved according to the reviewer’s comments and it can be seen in red colour on page 11.

Why the authors didn't try other treatments as the patient didn't respond to steroids?

This part has been explained on page 12 and it can be seen in red colour as well.

REFERENCES

Those repeated references have been eliminated and the whole article has been corrected accordingly.

Ref 40 has been completed.