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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected association between diseases or symptoms

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: 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?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

**Comments to authors:**

1 - There are no references in the introduction part.
2 - In the discussion part, references are not sufficient.
3 - On the fourth paragraph of the discussion part, long version of the abbreviation "FNAC" is not stated.
4 - It is ambiguous that how did the authors reach the conclusion of fine needle aspiration cytology (not discussed enough).
5 - On the 6th reference, "(Article in Japanese with English abstract)" part should be deleted.

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

I declare that I have no competing interests.