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Reviewer's report:

The paper is still too long and complicated for a case report, and the necessary changes have not been performed.

The title is still wrong with "Fetal". Should be changed to "Fatal"

Abstract
Line 8: What do you mean by "systemic large research"? Do you mean systematic reviews?
Line 18: What is mild ileus? Is it subileus?
Line 23: How can you know that there were ulcers in the whole small intestine. Was a peroperative endoscopy performed?
Line 41: The decision of surgery is not difficult in the case of perforation! The patients with symptoms of perforation must always be operated!
Line 51: Multicenter studies: how and why?

Background
Line 4: The diagnosis of ISCU is by endoscopy!
Line 12: "diversely termed" is not correct wording.
Line 24: It is not correct that most of the cases remain undiagnosed until laparotomy. Firstly, only a few patients undergo emergency surgery or elective cases. Most cases are diagnosed by endoscopy or capsule endoscopy.
Line 43: "a very rare case" - example of one of many repetitions.
Line 49: Very strange, that the patient should have given informed consent on publication by admission! Later it is stated that no consent was necessary! Do not understand how the patient informations were anonymized.

Case presentation
Line 13: Repetition of the consent
Line 18: what is a "non-family" history and "non-past" medical history?
Line 26: "body temperature was 36.9 at admission and not "in the emergency room"
Line 29: Blood cell count cannot be in "mm3"
Line 32: Bowel sound cannot be "decreased". Silent or weak should be used.
Line 52: Repetition of "small wholes"
Line 10: what is "dirty mucosa"
Line 16-19: Repetitions
Line 27: How was the anastomosis sutured? What do you mean by carefully performed?
Line 52: What kind of coagulants were administered?

Literature review
Still no information on the search strategy and the results are not presented systematically with special reference to the present case. I still do not understand why the authors state that the present case can be the first reported case as reference 6 include 9 patients with perforation!

The literature review should focus upon the surgical treatment of the disease, indications, surgical technique and the outcome.

Discussion
Very long, unsystematic and containing a lot of repetitions.
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No

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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