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Which of the following 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?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General
1- It is clear that significant improvements have been performed by the authors in the quality of language and drafting of the manuscript.

2- However, one may not ignore the deficiency of an image or a perfect figure to document the presence of a congenital surgical pathology. In this specific case appendectomy materials have been presented only, which may be advocated not to be persuasive after publication.

3- Otherwise the paper may be considered suitable for publication after minor linguistic revisions with the editorial decision for mentioned difficulty of the reported case on the comment 2.
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
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