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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?: 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?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

I think the content of this report is of interest, however it is poorly written. The references are sparse. The ideas are not adequately developed. This paper has merit potential, but only if extensively rewritten.

Introduction:

Limit the discussion of the reference describing a series of unruptured aneurysms. One should avoid listing the findings of the paper, rather offer summary comments. The last sentence should include a statement regarding the subsequent rupture and its temporal proximity to the initial presentation. There should also be a comment regarding why this is interesting/important.

Case:
- Measurement numbers indicate the aneurysm doubled in size (0.8 to 1.6 mm in maximal diameter) please confirm. The text describes a ‘slight’ increase in size which would be contradictory to the measurements.

Discussion:

The ideas are strong, but the writing does not reach a minimum quality standard. There are numerous grammatical errors. The descriptions of references – similar to the introduction – are overly detailed and tend to reiterate the findings of the referenced paper without any interpretation or discussion relating to the current case. Although the reader can infer the points being made in each paragraph, they are not well described or developed.

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited