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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?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This case is interesting and has value due to rarity of the condition. However, there exist some missing parts in the report and some other parts to be corrected.

1. The manuscript needs some language corrections.
2. The author must read again "the Instructions for Authors" and make relevant corrections.
   a) There has to be no abbreviation in the Abstract
   b) There is no need to say "Mr K.A" in the Case Presentation. A male or female patient is better. In addition, if the patient is male (Mr), the following sentence there is written "her physical examination".
   c) The author should use a specific "time" while writing. I mean, the author uses
simple present tense in a sentence, and simple past tense in another.
d) In the discussion section, the authors abbreviates hydatid cyst as KH. The abbreviation is not suitable. In addition, they had to use this abbreviation in the first time they wrote hydatid cyst.
e) "Conclusion" section and "patient perspectives" sections are missing.
f) The references should be marked using [ ], not using ( ).
g) Ethnical background of the patient was not given in the abstract section.
3. The conclusion part of the abstract is so weak, and needs to be re-written.
4. The introduction the of the manuscript is very short. It must be longer and contain references.
5. Case presentation should be revised. The postoperative length of stay should be given. The author should give details about the hydatid serology they used. The pathological examination result is missing. There is no information about the follow-up duration of the patient.
6. In the discussion section, the authors must give some information about the place of the serological examination in the hydatid disease.
3.

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