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I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Comments to authors:

General
The authors have reported on a case of the self – insertion of a foreign body into the urethra. As the authors clearly state all manner of foreign objects have been inserted into the lower urinary tract for a variety of reasons (mental problems, sexual gratification etc) and all urologists will have come across this during their practice.

Unfortunately the case described is generally uninteresting as a published case report as there appears to be no obvious diagnostic difficulty since the telephone wire was clearly visible ‘sticking out’ from the urethra and the only other diagnostic modality was a plain radiograph to confirm the position and knotting of the wire. Nor was the removal of the telephone wire of particular interest as it was removed by simply pulling it with L.A. gel. The case would have more clinical merit if it presented a diagnostic challenge or described an interesting method of removal. Unfortunately the case satisfies neither of these criteria.

The authors have performed a brief but informative literature review of the topic but again this serves little purpose as previous reviews have been done and
have been referenced in the manuscript, and this is therefore solely a curious case of another inserted foreign body; in this instance a telephone wire. There is little to be learnt by a reader from this case. As a suggestion, perhaps the manuscript could be rewritten as a more formal and thorough up-to-date review of foreign bodies within the lower urinary tract with a detailed description of various diagnostic and removal techniques. This case could be incorporated into such a review as an illustrative case. Obviously such a review would not be suitable for this journal which solely publishes case reports.

For these reasons, despite it being well written and researched, I don’t feel that the case merits publication in this journal.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Revisions necessary for publication
None as I don’t feel that it is suitable for publication.

What next?: Reject

Quality of written English: Acceptable