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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: None

If other, please specify:

It is a rare case report in the literature but urethral caruncle is often seen in the outpatient clinic. Discussion is poor and not mention why they did the operation.

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?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This is a rare case report in the English literature but we often see in the clinic. In your discussion, you mention that biopsy of the mass is not required for diagnosis but your case was partially removed. It was not mention why you have to remove the mass. This case, the mass is not irregular or not increasing the size. It is just the natural history of urethral caruncle for me. It might be better to mention why this disease is more common in menopause age group and didn't occur in puberty. Is this also common in female and not in male? Why steroid or estrogen
hormone is affected in these cases. These are more interesting than just your reported the cases.

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Declaration of competing interests:**

'I declare that I have no competing interests' below.