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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?: 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
This is an interesting case report to inform clinicians taking care of women with uterine fibroids. It is well written and the literature review is comprehensive and covers major areas that a clinician will need to address. The presentation is good and literature review up-to-date. However, the language and conclusions drawn from this case report need revisions.

Revisions necessary for publication
1. Language: There are grammatical errors that need to be corrected. E.g. First paragraph of abstract, line 4, “In specific” should be “In particular”, and anywhere else in the article. Last paragraph under abstract, I suggest that “literature analysis” be replaced by “literature review”, “sole” by “single”. Page 2, Last paragraph, last line, “greatest” should be replaced by “greatest diameter”. Page 3, first paragraph, line 2, “celiotomy” by “laparotomy”. Page 3, line 7, look for a suitable word that can replace “objectivity”. Page 3, third to last paragraph, correct the following phrase “consequent diagnosis was leiomyoma”. There are many of such corrections, and I suggest you contact someone whose mother
tongue is English and who understands medical terms.

2. Your conclusions are not clear. You said “it is our belief that such therapies are of medical benefit”, but we don’t know which therapy you are talking about.

3. The conclusion in the abstract is not exactly the same as in the body of the text. Conclusion number (a) in the abstract is not clear- Is it a rationale or a conclusion? (The crux of our argument rests on the complexity of the relationship that exists between hormonal composition and growth stimuli and myoma cells). Is your belief a conclusion? Why do you include beliefs in conclusions?
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**What next?:** Accept after minor revisions

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