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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

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?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

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:
  It is an interesting article highlighting the intention that should be given to any patient with unilateral nasal discharge. The thorough history of previous nasal packing, meticulous ENT examination and appropriate imaging of each patient, is essential to reach to a right diagnosis. The article echoes that each case with unilateral nasal discharge is due to nasal foreign body, until proven otherwise. Inspite of the patient being diabetic and having congestive heart failure, he tolerated a nasal foreign body which is the anterior nasal pack for many years. However the explanation for this condition was not mentioned in the report. The references of the review report are listed downhere.

- Revisions necessary for publication:
  1-The reason of nose bleed over 12 years ago which led to nasal packing as mentioned in the report.
2- The report did not mention the material of the extracted calcified nasal pack. The extension of the infection from the nasal passages to the paranasal sinuses depends on the type, duration and site of the nasal pack.

REPORT TEMPLATE

Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?
- Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease
- An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

Has the case been reported coherently?
- No
The report did not determine the exact years of the presenting symptoms. Also did not explain the reason of being “a ticking time-bomb” for 12 years.

Is the case report authentic?
The CT scan is attached, meanwhile other investigations are not attached. Also the main cause of nose bleeds is not documented.

Is the case report ethical?
- Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?
- Yes
Information about the main cause of nose bleed, the exact duration of present symptoms, the type of the removed nasal pack.

Is this case worth reporting?
- Yes, provided the authors incorporate the revisions made in this report.

Is the case report persuasive?
No, because it lacks the explanatory value.

Does the case report have explanatory value?
- No, The report did not explain why this longstanding nasal pack in a diabetic patient did not lead to complications.

It is documented in literature that the different types of nasal pack, site, duration and the patient’s general condition lead to consequence complications...1, 2 Long standing nasal pack lead to either local allergic fungal sinusitis or systematic complications like sepsis.

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
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