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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: Findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect.

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

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?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General
It does give further information on the possibility of "benign" perigraft air in the first month following surgery, although the author has not really given thoughts to the cause of the benign perigraft.

Revisions necessary for publication
First, there are some grammatical error. Eg. page 1 line 5 "the perigraft air become a significant finding...." line 8 "a" pyrexia
line 10 " had resolved {without} completely"
The author should revise or edit the whole manuscript.

second, the definition of early postoperative phase is not clear and thus, should be defined.
Lastly, the discussion should be expanded, possible discussion: why there is perigraft air in this particularly post op period, why it is benign etc..

What next?: Revise and resubmit

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