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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

I originally felt that this manuscript was not suitable for publication, and although the revised manuscript is an improvement, I still feel that there is very little scientific merit in the described case. I however acknowledge the hard work of the authors in revising the manuscript.

My main issues are:

1. All manor of objects have been inserted into the urinary tract (as acknowledged by the authors and described in previous reviews); and this case report simply describes another such object. All practicing urologists will encounter this problem in their training and practice. Therefore this report is not unique or particularly interesting.

2. The diagnosis of the inserted foreign body was obvious; as part of it was protruding from the urethra, therefore there is very little diagnostic value to the case report.
3. The removal of the foreign body was accomplished by simply pulling the protruding part of the foreign body. Therefore the management of the foreign body was straightforward and did not involve any particular dilemma or use of an interesting technique for removal. Of note, A&E failed to remove the foreign body by simply pulling it out, yet the authors chose to pull it out without attempting a more invasive procedure such as cystoscopy. The authors fail to explain why they felt it appropriate to pull it out when they describe the object as being 'badly coiled' in the bladder. It would perhaps be interesting for them to discuss why they choose to persevere with noninvasively trying to remove this particular foreign body.

The authors have however included a more thorough review of the literature to serve as background to the case, as suggested in my previous review. But, I still feel that for the practising urologist (who should be most interested in this case) this particular case will be of very little interest.

I also note that the patient failed to attend for follow-up, yet it is stated that written informed consent has been taken. If the manuscript is to be published then I think it should be clarified when the informed consent was taken. I suspect it was taken during the initial hospitalisation but I would like for this to be confirmed.

---

Revisions necessary for publication

Although the text is perfectly comprehensible, there are a number of grammatical errors and switching tenses throughout the manuscript, that detract from the overall quality of the manuscript. Ideally, it would improve the quality of the manuscript if the authors would carefully proof read the manuscript prior to publication.

As stated the timing of the consent should be clarified.

The authors should state why they choose not to perform a cystoscopic removal of the wire when it was described as being 'badly coiled' within the bladder.

What next?: Reject

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published