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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?: Yes

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:

Review of Servelle-Mortorell Syndrome with extensive upper limb involvement a case report

The authors describe an unusual case of enlargement of the upper limb associated with vascular malformations. The case report is interesting and does deserve publication however I feel that the authors should considerably improve the manuscript before it is accepted.

I will raise areas for improvement as follows:

The first couple of sentences are untidy and must be improved. A simple description and why the case is unusual will suffice here. The use of the word stresses the need for suspecting SM syndrome in the final sentence is too harsh. The case highlights the syndrome in upper limb hypertrophy only.

The introduction is fair but the English needs to be improved e.g. imagings and the final sentence is very poor English indeed and this reflects poorly on the remainder of the paper.

The case presentation also needs tidying up. There is overuse of the word
swellings and other descriptive terms should be used. The general flow of this section is poor.

The final sentences of the case should report the management of this case. I feel the varying management options could be added to the discussion to enable the paper to be of more educational value for the reader.

The first line of the discussion is merely a repeat of the first line of the introduction and the authors should decide where this should go. The paper by Langer is very interesting and explains why the case is particularly unusual to the reader however unfortunately the English is clumsy and this should be improved.

Summary:

An interesting case worthy of publication but unfortunately the paper is poorly written.

I would recommend that the authors revise and resubmit the paper. It has some excellent comments and is a good case.

**What next?:** Revise and resubmit

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