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Which of the following 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?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

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:

I read with interest the case report by Dr Kontopoulou in which they report a rare case of adult Kawasaki disease in a European/Greek patient. The presentation of such pathology in a non Asian patient is in itself quite interesting and as such the report merits publication.

Overall the manuscript is well written and the report is adequately elaborated and presented. However, my feeling is that it is quite extensive and long and would benefit from some reduction in size in certain areas (i.e. abstract, introduction, case presentation).

Specifically:

1. The abstract appears slightly over 250 words. If this is so maybe it should be
reduced in size.

2. The introduction although very informative and well written is too long at 4 pages. Could the authors kindly reduce its size?

3. What do the authors mean when they report “some years ago” don’t they have a patient file with an admission date? When did the patient present and was admitted to hospital (in months or in years)?

4. What is “enormous malaise” reported in the case presentation and the abstract, how can you quantify it? Maybe linguistically the use “significant” is more appropriate.

5. The case presentation although thorough appears to elaborate and long. Can the authors omit some of the superfluous test reporting that may not be contributing to the understanding of the case (i.e. all the negative test results, his complete physical examination findings even the non significant ones ect.)

6. The authors do not explain in their discussion section what made them consider such a rare pathology as Kawasaki disease in their differential diagnosis? Were there specific clinical signs, laboratory results ect or was it a diagnosis of exclusion and if so how did the confirm this).

In conclusion, I would be happy to recommend this work for publication on the merit of its rarity and if the authors are able to address the above 6 issues.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

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