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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?: No

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

While uncommon, rectus sheath hematoma has been widely reported. In fact, the authors did not cite/reference a report of 126 cases at a single institution (Rectus sheath hematoma: Review of 126 cases at a single institution. Medicine. 2006;85:105-110).

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Revisions necessary for publication

The authors make the same conclusions as the aforementioned reference—which had, by far, more cases. The authors should cite this reference and clearly describe why their report is a unique addition to the literature.

I like the description of the CT classification system. Perhaps a diagram could be added to the report which depicts the various types (p. 4).

Were the cases seen at the same institution? Please clarify.

P. 3: Should be "complete blood count."
P. 3: What is a "control CT"? Do you mean "follow-up CT"?
There are very many English syntax errors that will need to be corrected.

What next?: Revise and resubmit

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