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Which of the following 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?: No

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:

- Revisions necessary for publication
1. The presentation of the case is not sufficient: If the lightning strike (LS) caused esophageal perforation, there can be some other injuries accompanying, for example, lung parenchymal injury or contusion. It should be mentioned whether there was also lung injury due to LS or not.
2. What about the entry-exit point of current from the body, were there any signs of burn in the skin.
3. As the authors mentioned, the patient was hemodinamically unstable and in septic shock, so, is not it total esophagectomy a major and life-threatening surgery for such a patient. If there is something lacking about the patient condition, it should be reported and the endication of such a major surgery should be explained.
4. The discussion is very poor. There is nothing new or original, only what is known about the lighting strike and its mechanism is repeated. The contribution of the present case to the literature should be emphasized in the discussion section, at least some critics about the management of patient should be emphasized. For example, conservative management of such a patient (supportive treatment, minimal invaziv procedures such as drainage catheters and esophageal stent application for controlling leakage while the patient was in septic shock) should be proposed as conclusion.

5. Figures should be more explanatory for readers, for example, leakage point can be marked with arrows.

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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