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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

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 think the case is interesting and worth reporting, mainly to emphasise the possibility of multiple level injuries in the same limb following trauma. This reminds us of the need for vigilance and careful assessment of patients, and not to assume that the obvious injury is the only injury.

I would suggest that the report is re-written, however, as there are one or two points that I think need to be presented more clearly. In the introduction the is a sentence indicating that the patient had elbow pain at review 2 weeks following the injury, but while it is stated in the case report section that the wound was checked at 2 weeks, it seems the dislocation was diagnosed at 5 weeks. Further comment would help the reader to appreciate why the elbow injury was not apparent at 2 weeks - it would be expected that some features of an injury to the
elbow would have been present. Similarly at the end of the discussion it is indicated that there was no instability detectable on screening initially, but in the case report section it says that no formal testing for instability was undertaken. Overall the reader may be left with the speculation that there was an injury to the elbow at the initial accident, but it was not detected. It seems unlikely that there could have been a completely undetectable disruption substantial enough to allow subsequent dislocation.

The case has some similarities to those cited in references, in that there are injuries at different levels in the same limb, and could emphasise the importance of being aware of this possibility.

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