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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?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

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:

> Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?
  - Yes
  - the rationale to hold off on surgery for an intrathoracic esophageal rupture will be open to criticism

> Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?
  - Yes
  - the rationale to hold off on surgery for an intrathoracic esophageal rupture will be open to criticism
> Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?
- No
- unless case can be more strongly made that lightning was the sole contributor

> Comments to authors
- Suggest reviewing and consider incorporating the attached reference and well as reviewing its bibliography

> Needs some language corrections before being published
- Minor edit: people don't "pass away" they die - language in medical journal should be objective/concise

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