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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?: 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?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

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:

I am struggling to find relevance in this case report. Recurrent "urinary sepsis," or recurrent urinary tract infection as we would say in the US, is a very common condition in women, especially with diabetes. The authors do not comment on the presence or disappearance of the condition after surgery, which would at least help to show that it was related to the tumor. Also, they purport that the recurrent infections were due to compression of the kidney; however, that would cause pyelonephritis not cystitis as is implied in the text. Perhaps the authors could clarify whether this was cystitis or pyelonephritis. Urinary tract infections can be related to sexual intercourse, and there is no description of a sexual history from the patient. Finally, the classic signs and symptoms of pheochromocytoma were present at the initial evaluation of the patient and these seemed to guide the workup rather than the recurrent urinary tract infection.
Quality of written English: Acceptable
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