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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?: No

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:

The manuscript is incoherent in places and therefore very difficult to assess. It probably does not do justice to the case as a result. Most likely this is because English is not the native language of the authors. However, the manuscript needs almost completely re-writing.

A few examples:

"...woman was admitted to hospital with clinical data for chronic cholecystitis.."
"...abdominal ultrasonography...dubious data for a stone in the cystic duct..."
"Its immunohistochemical study revealed...serotonin gastrin etc."

The choice of the phrase "herein we present a fairly uncommon case.." is unfortunate. Many things are "fairly uncommon" this would imply to me that it is not worthy of reporting in the literature.

"Severe abdominal pain in the region of the right ribcage" is too non-specific.

what does "with unconvincing peritoneal signs" mean? It is contradictory to then say Murphy's sign was positive.
again "no data of a stone in the region of the cystic duct were found for certain" is a meaningless sentence.

What is "chronic exacerbated cholecystits"? I have never heard this term before.

Was the cyst visualised on ultrasound?

It would be useful to clearly identify the cyst on the clinical image take during surgery.

The conclusion is speculation and the case does not prove causality.

If the case is to be resubmitted to this or any other english language journal then I would strongly recommend that a native english speaker revise the content to make it more intelligible.

What next?: Reject

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited