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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

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:

I have the following comments to the authors:

1. The authors should pay more attention to their perioperative antiseptic protocol. This includes preoperative preparation of the patient as well as perioperative antibiotic policy. This can lead us to a conclusion of which maneuvers we must follow to avoid such a complication.

2. The authors didn't give an explanation for the early occurrence of pleural effusion postoperatively. How can the patient get pleural effusion in such an early stage without without an existing pneumonia or opening the pleura.

3. Attached to the previous question, There was no preoperative echocardiography to exclude the possibility of postoperative decompensation. The postoperative echo is described as: “slight impairment of left ventricular systolic function”.
4. The authors didn’t discuss the possibility that the servical wound perhaps was not efficiently drained with accumulation of serosangunous fluid in the anterior mediastinum leading to infection.

Minor comments:
- Page 5, line 3: the exact dose and type of catecholamines should be mentioned.
- Page 5, line 23: Tetraparesis? Do the authors mean: quadroparesis?
- Page 6, line 4: “A right-side arm-accentuated tetraparesis”? Please give a clear description of the sign.
- Page 6, line 20: adynamia of the right arm? Do the authors mean: monoplegia of the right arm?
- Page 8, line 23: “The radiological diagnostics is…..” should read: “The radiological diagnostics are…..”
- Age 11, line 2: “the patinet had not complained” should read: “the patient did not complain”
- Page 11, line 6, “misdiagnosis is in 59% of cases celulitis” should read “misdiagnosis is celulitis in 59% of cases”.
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