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I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 9 criteria for evaluation in the journal: Unreported or unusual side effects or adverse interactions involving medications

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General comments:
Although the manuscript doesn't present any significant novelty in itself, it can illustrate an uncommon complication arising from the technique.

Revisions necessary for publication:
1 - The major complications of feeding Jejunostomy are described in literature with different prevalences. Smith & Soucy described 21.9% of major morbidity, and Date et al. described more recently only 4.7%. I believe that this difference could be partially related with the particular experience of each institution. I think it would be interesting to report the number of jejunostomies being done each year.

2 - In this particular case, the type of jejunostomy executed should be highlighted, and also if needle catheter jejunostomy was considered.

3 - In the third paragraph, the diagnosis of aspiration pneumonia was done without referring to any chest X-ray. Was this exam performed, and if so, what were the observable alterations?
4 â## Did the CT scan reveal any signs of intestinal ischemia? In the laparotomy, were there any signs of intestinal necrosis?

**What next?:** Accept after minor revisions

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable