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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?: No

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?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The authors present a case of urethral leiomyoma treated with local excision.

The case is interesting and worthy of publication and describes a relatively uncommon tumour of the urethra.

Compulsorily revisions:

Comment 1.

The manuscript needs to be rewritten with focus on avoiding repetition and contradictory statements so that it is clearer and easier to follow for the reader, although I comprehend what the authors were saying I believe the manuscript could be re-written so that it is easier for the reader to follow. They seem to jump between discussion about leiomyoma in general and specific urethral...
malignancies which can be confusing for the reader, they frequently describe the tumor as both "rare" and "common"

For example:

Introduction page 2 the authors state that the tumour is a:

“Urethral leiomyoma’s are rare benign mesenchymal tumors that originate from the smooth muscle of the urethra”

Later in the text they indicated it is the most common soft tissue tumor of the urethra:

“Even though Leiomyoma is the most expected common soft tissue tumor of the urethra”

then on page 5 they state that leiomyoma are common in the GU tract:

“The tumors tend to be relatively common in the genitourinary and gastrointestinal tracts” and that of 7749 leiomyoma 95% occurred in the genital tract “According to Farman’s [8] study on 7749 leiomyomas cases, approximately 95% occurred in the genital tract,”

then on page 4 they state “Urethral leiomyomas are classified under tumors of the deep soft tissue and are very rare”

they then state that leiomyoma are the least common benign neoplasm of the urethra page 4

“ papillomas being the most common and the leiomyomas being among the least common [3]”

this is confusing for the reader and the authors need to re-write the manuscript in a logical sequence ie it is likely that leiomyoma are indeed common soft tissue malignancies and do occur in organs such as the uterus and as the authors indicate kidney relatively frequently. The presentation of a urethral leiomyoma is however rare and the introduction and discussion needs to make this clear

Comment 2:
also I think the following statement is misleading

“ The majority of tumor is malignant, and most are carcinomas and are more common in females than in the males.”

By definition a benign leiomyoma is a benign tumour and the authors have indicated this previously in the text at numerous points. It is unclear if the authors are making this comment in relation to the tumour being discussed.

Comment 3 - Page 3

Hypertension and diabetes can be removed from the following statement as they are not necessary “She had two caesarean deliveries in the past but had no
chronic disease (hypertension, diabetes).”

Comment 4 - Page 3

The following statement needs to be reworded to remove redundancy
“Resection tumor was removed with sub-urethral incision (U shaped inverted) and wound sutured with three monocryl stitches”
for example could be changed to “The tumor was resected with sub-urethral incision (U shaped inverted).”
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