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

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?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

In General the authors have done a good job reporting on a rare presentation of diaphragm rupture. The case itself is enough to be considered for publication. However, i would have 3 broad recommendations in order for it to be satisfactory for publication in a respectable journal.

1. The interesting part of the article is the presentation of the patient. Thus, the report of the case should include more about the finding at surgery including the viability of the herniated bowel or any ischemic changes or perforation etc.. As well, the discussion should focus on these potential complications rather than so much on different mesh closures etc... essentially irrelevant to the case here... if anything the authors should stress more that primary closure is the operation of choice... they imply the opposite...
2. This is a case of blunt trauma and the introduction and discussion should essentially omit any reference to penetrating diaphragm injuries. It will allow the case to be reported and discussed in a 'cleaner' manner.

3. There are numerous grammatical and spelling errors. I have mentioned a few in the next section. If not already done, the authors should have their document reviewed by someone extremely comfortable and competent in the written English language.

> - Revisions necessary for publication

In addition to numbers 1 and 2 above.... details on number 3 wrt grammar spelling:

- in the abstract, section on Case presentation, the second to last sentence should read... 'through' a diaphragm rupture... and the last sentence should read... underwent laparotomy, 'at which time' the colon and small intestine were reduced 'back into' the abdomen...

- in the abstract Conclusion, 3rd sentence should read ...contribute to 'earlier' diagnosis (omit 'more' and 'and correct')...in the second to last sentence, should read...when 'the' diaphragmatic defect...

and the last sentence should read 'small to moderate sized' diaphragmatic defects...

- In the main body of the manuscript...in the Introduction section, 3rd sentence, should read... herniated organs in right-sided... (omit 'the')

- In the case presentation section, 2nd sentence should read 'past medical history'... and omit 'blunt trauma'... redundant

- 'dyspnea was referred' ?? not a phrase... what do they mean?

- 5th sentence... "for a " diaphragmatic rupture... (makes no sense grammatically)

- Discussion section: 2nd sentence should read... 'because of its low incidence, and presence of associated injuries...' 

- omit sentence 'sometimes its cause is penetrating injuries'...

- should read... 'in the present case'...

- should read... 'the diaphragmatic hernia was diagnosed'...

- should read... 'diaphragm elevation, and a gas shadow'...

- should read... 'CT scan confirmed the diagnosis'...

- should read... ' a defect of only 5 cm was found'...

- should read... 'Fig 3, located postero-laterally'... (omit 'and')

- should read... 'The herniated right colon and small intestine (4O cm)

- should read... ' complications such as strangulation and perforation'...

- should read... '...Dacron, and polypropylene are the most common materials...'..
should read...'porcine dermis for repairing large...'
should read...'...patch infection and hernia recurrence...'
eliminate last paragraph of case (starting with Moss RL et al...)
In the conclusions section: first sentence should read 'A high index of suspicion for diaphragmatic rupture in a polytrauma patient may...
next sentence should read...'Surgical repair...
second to last sentence should read '...small to moderate sized defects...'
last sentence should read '...large defects may require patch closure'
in the figure 2 legend: 'herniation' should be 'hernia'

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