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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

RELEVANCE - Does this case report make a contribution to medical knowledge, have educational value, or highlight the need for a change in clinical practice or diagnostic/prognostic approaches?

No, the findings of this report are well known and/or similar reports have already been published

CASE DESCRIPTION - Are the details of the case sufficiently well described to understand the patient's symptoms and course of treatment?

No - there are major issues

DIAGNOSIS/INTERPRETATION - Based on the facts presented, are the diagnosis, interpretation, and course of treatment medically sound?

No, based on information contained in the report, the authors' interpretation of this case is unsound

DISCUSSION OF THE CASE - Does the discussion appropriately analyse the importance of the findings and their relevance to future understanding of disease processes, diagnosis or treatment? Has an adequate literature review pertinent to the case been included?

No - there are major issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?

Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:
GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors describe a vesico-rectal fistula in a patient with a neurogenic bladder. They have no proof of causation and have not elaborated how they excluded other pathology as a cause of the fistula. Although the authors claim this is the first case report of such pathology, I am therefore unhappy with the title and the overall conclusions of the case report.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

Relevance - There are only a handful cases with (presumably) spontaneous vesico-rectal fistulas, so this can be considered for publication.

Description - The authors need to explain how they excluded other pathology in the recum/colon and other pelvic organs (e.g. endoscopy, contrast studies, imaging)

Interpretation - They need to emphasise on other investigations - see above comment

Discussion - They need to emphasise on other investigations - see above comment

Overall, the language needs significant improvement, e.g.

P2 Line 47 - Faecal and urinary incontinence

P2 line 59 - "Further controls showed an improvement of hydronephrosis" - Needs rephrasing, it doesn't make sense

P3 Line 1 - Lost to follow-up

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

Include results of other investigations which excluded other pathology

Please confirm that you have included your review in the ‘Comments to Author’ box?

As a minimum standard, please include a few sentences that outline what you think are the authors' hypothesis/objectives, their main results, and the conclusions drawn. Your report should constructively instruct authors on how they can strengthen their paper to the point where it may be acceptable for publication, or provide detailed reasons as to why the manuscript does not fulfill our criteria for consideration. Please supply appropriate evidence using examples from the manuscript to substantiate your comments. Please break your comments into two bulleted or numbered sections: major and minor comments.

Please note that we may not be able to use your review if no comments are provided.
Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included as text in the ‘Comments to Author’ box.

Yes

**Are the methods appropriate and well described to allow independent reproduction of experiments?**

Please state in the ‘Comments to Authors’ box below what you think are the strengths and weaknesses of the methods (study design, data collection, and data analysis), and what is required, if anything, to improve the quality of reporting.

No

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**

If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

Yes

**Are you able to assess the statistics?**

- Are the statistical test(s) used in this study appropriate and well described?

- Is the exact sample size (n) reported for each experimental group/condition (as a number, not a range)?

- Are the description of any error bars and probability values appropriate?

- Are all error bars defined in the corresponding figure legends?

- Has a sample size calculation been included, or a description and rationale about how sample sizes were chosen?

Please can you confirm which of the following statements apply to your statistical assessment of the manuscript (Please include details of what the authors need to address in the ‘Comments to Author’ box):

This question is not applicable to this manuscript

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**

If not, please explain in the ‘Comments to Author’ box below.

No

**Quality of written English**

Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
Should the manuscript be highlighted for promotional activity?
Articles that are deemed of interest to a broad audience can be promoted in a variety of ways. This could be through email updates, postings on the BioMed Central homepage, social media, blogs and/or press releases. Please indicate in the text box below whether you think this manuscript should be considered for promotional activity, indicating your reasons why (e.g. what is the most newsworthy aspect of the research).

No
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