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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Presentations, diagnoses and/or management of new and emerging diseases

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:

The manuscript is generally well written, but in my opinion conclusion is not appropriate. Conclusion should state importance of accurate preoperative diagnosis for the surgical plan management and other possible implications as a messeges to the readers.

The current conclusion of your manuscript("Gandhi et al had reported the first case of perforated duodenal ulcer with situsinversus in 1986 (10), we are reporting the second case of this nature in medical literature"), - could be written in the discussion, but new conclusion should be rewritten.
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