Reviewer's report

Title: Kaplan anastomosis of the ulnar nerve. A case report

Version: 2 Date: 2 November 2007

Reviewer: Marios Loukas

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?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

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

Comments to authors:

My main question regarding this case report is its clinical significance. The authors did not elaborate on the clinical significance of their findings. In addition, I dont think that there is any clinical significance from this variation.

Very often in reconstructive procedures of the hand these nerves can be severed and the patient has no complains post operativly.

The pictures of the manuscript is of low quality. Especially when the specimen is severy dried out. The schematic needs to be improved.

An ethical issue that i also see for this manuscript is the number of authors. This is a simple case report that is hard for me to believe that 7 authors contributed equally to the writing of the manuscript. In addition, the dissection was performed from 2 other people menionted in the aknowlegments. I dont think that 7 authors are justified to be in a simple cadaveric case report.

What next?: Reject

Quality of written English: Acceptable