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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: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

**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

Revisions necessary for publication

1. Throughout the manuscript, please change the reference to “loin” to “flank”.

2. Abstract, last sentence of case presentation: the authors do not know that the minor trauma caused this presentation; thus I would suggest to change last sentence to: “Repeated minor trauma….physiotherapy possibly contributed to….”

3. Page 3, case presentation paragraph: please clarify method of deroofing and marsupialisation procedure – i.e. open or laparoscopic?

4. Page 3, case presentation paragraph: clarify “reflective fluid”. Do the authors mean “reactive fluid”? Or is this description referring to some imaging finding?

5. Several words should be changed.
a. “commonest” to “most common”
b. “able bodied” to “ambulatory”
c. “squashed” to “compressed”
d. “thin-built” to “thin”

6. The authors should consider changing their conclusions as there is little indication that they should have recognized the vulnerability of this cyst to rupture. Likewise, the authors have no firm proof that the minor trauma caused this rupture, thus, I would refrain from stating that the trauma “probably” led to the rupture, and instead state that the trauma “possibly” led to the rupture.

What next?: Accept after minor revisions

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