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Reviewer’s report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments: Ethics statements are properly described throughout the manuscript.

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

a. The relevant patient information, including:

- De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)

- Main symptoms of the patient

- Medical, family and psychosocial history

- Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

b. The relevant physical examination findings

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at $T = 0$, follow up at $T = 1$ month.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
- Diagnostic methods
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention
f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: All the necessary information is presented to the case presentation section.

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: The authors include all the necessary information in order to support the content of this case report.

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: Yes, it is a well-structured and informative abstract.

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: It can be useful for the literature and the clinical practice.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

I hereby present my personal comments to the authors:

1. Did you cause any leakage or rupture of the tumor during the surgery? Was your patient positive for peritoneal carcinomatosis?

2. Did you perform a frozen biopsy as a rapid pathological examination?

3. Please use only past tenses throughout your case presentation and don't confuse present with past ones.

4. The first sentence of your case report must be rewritten as it is insufficient.
5. Please rewrite the case presentation in order to use more proper medical language.

6. Moreover, you should add the figure references, where is needed, throughout the case presentation.

7. At the end of the discussion section, please do not repeat facts from case presentation but, instead of this, present your diagnostic/therapeutic steps or concerns or how all the factors, such as tumor size, location, existence of perforation, influence your surgical approach.

8. Use the abbreviation CT throughout the manuscript as it is included to the abbreviation section.

9. Please shorten the legends of figures one and two.

10. The English language should be revised throughout the manuscript by a native speaker in order this draft be suitable for publication. Also, the spelling should be revised (for example: at 7th line of background, gander → gender and at 8th line of case report, laparotom → laparotomy).

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

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

Needs some language corrections before being published

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?
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