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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect

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?: 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:

In the manuscript, the authors report a case of a patient with hyperinsulinemic hypoglycemia. The patient was carefully investigated and no pancreatic tumor was found. A partial Pancreatectomy was performed and diffuse hyperplasia of #-cells was identified. After the surgical procedure, hypoglycemic episodes disappeared. The authors also demonstrated that membrane potentials were not normal in this patient.

The manuscript is very interesting and well written. It provides new insights in the pathogenesis of NIPHS. However, it requires a few modifications and clarifications before it can be accepted for publication.
1) The authors consider that NIPHS and Nesiodioblastosis are synonymous. This is not correct. It seems that NIPHS is a clinical entity with clinical and histopathological characteristics that are different from nesidioblastosis.

2) The authors demonstrated that #-cells from the patient were despolarized even in low glucose concentrations. The authors should include also in the manuscript a control group of cells, so we can compare the differences in membrane potential. The inclusion of figures (both Figure 1 and 2) of normal cells will improve the quality of the manuscript and allow a comparison between NIPHS and normal individuals.

3) The last paragraph of “Case Presentation” should be moved to the Conclusion.

4) “Conclusion” should be carefully reviewed. The authors should discuss the impact of their main findings in the pathogenesis of NIPHS and how these findings could impact the pharmacological treatment of these patients. “Conclusion” should be the most important part of the manuscript. In this case, it should be extensively improved (including references) to stress all the real clinical relevance of the manuscript.
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