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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?: Yes

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:

The case description may be abstracted and improved to make it clearer and easier to understand. It should be interesting to show the estimated amount of fluid drained from the abdomen, and comment why it was not detected on the two or more ultrasound performed before the cesarean section on this obese young female. There are several typing mistakes (“masses or sions seen on uterus”). Acronims (ECHO) must be explained on the text. Why levels of cholesterol and triglycerides are in SI units and other figures in metric units?.

What was the role, if any, played by antibiotics (cephalosporin and gentamicin) on the resolution of the chylous ascites?

The patient was followed up for a short period with ultrasound of the abdomen, an imaging study that has poor results in morbid obese patients. Could the authors comment on this?
The discussion section is good, with a general survey of hypothetical causes of the clinical picture. But what was the role of the related multiple comorbidities of the patient, obesity included?

The quality of the english text should be improved.

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