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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 authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

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

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:

The main idea, or argument, of this case report (a clinically suspected glucagoma with a low blood glucagon level) is not addressed until the Discussion. There needs to be some small phrase to get the readers attention: Why is this unusual? Tell the reader that the patient has the clinical symptoms of glucagonoma syndrome, but the serum levels are low. Has this been reported in the literature? This needs to be stated early to get the readers attention. Also, it was noted that serum glucagon levels were depressed, but the method was not stated up front.

The usage of "stain" should be avoided in discussion of immunohistochemistry. Trichrome is a stain, glucagon is an immunohistochemical reaction. Again, when discussing the Polyclonal Rabbit Anti-Human glucagon it should be referred to as
an antibody and not an immunostain.

There are several style and usage errors, including, but not limited to:
1) Using past tense in the abstract.
2) The wording of the abstract is awkward and needs to be rewritten.
3) The gender distribution of a tumor cannot be biased. Nature isn’t biased, people are.
4) In the introduction, there are numerous references, but in the third paragraph there are none.
5) Glicentin should not be capitalized.
6) There is no need to put the dates (e.g. 2006, 1991) due to privacy issues.
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