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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unreported or unusual side effects or adverse interactions involving medications

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?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Many Thanks for submitting the article with Medical Case Reports.

I found your case unique especially in regards to POSSIBLE association of spontaneous bi-lateral retroperitoneal hemorrhage with an oral NSAID use.

1. It would be nice to make a mention of the retroperitoneal occurrence associated with intervention of IV thrombolytics (e.g. J Neurol Sci. 2011 Jul 15;306(1-2):160-3. Epub 2011 Apr 16.)

2. Please also make a mention of the platelet counts and the coagulation profile at the time of patient presentation and if any corrective measures had to be instigated (if found to be deranged.) And the alternate NSAID therapy choice when stopped Nimesulide.
3. Figure 2 A- it would be helpful to also point an arrow at the leaking vessel along with the leakage arrow.

4. I noticed few minor grammatical issues, please correct them.

5. And lastly the treatment section can be made a little concise.

Thanks again for your efforts.

Best

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