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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unreported or unusual side effects or adverse interactions involving medications

Do you believe the case report is authentic?: Yes, it is authentic.

Do you have any ethical concerns?: No.

Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?: Yes, but in the introduction, the authors did not describe the unusual case.

Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?: No, the author should accompany it.

Does the article report relevant patient information?: Yes

Does the article report relevant physical examination findings?: Yes

Does the article report important dates and times in this case?: Yes

Does the article report the diagnostic assessments?: Yes

Does the article report the types of intervention?: Yes

Does the article report a summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits?: Yes

If any information is missing from the reporting, please detail it here.: No.
Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?:

Yes, the discussion and conclusion was well balanced and supported by the case presented.

Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?:

Yes, it is a useful contribution to the medical literature.

Was written informed consent to publish this case obtained?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?:

Yes.

Additional comments to authors?:

This is an unusual case. However, in the manuscript, there are some errors, mainly writing side.
In additional, the authors should provide USG picture.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

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