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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: none

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: none

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

Comments: yes

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

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

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

The authors report the case of a female patient with sodium chloride pica associated with recurrent nephrolithiasis. This is an unusual situation of increased sodium chloride intake and as the authors suggest could have been the main underlying cause for recurrent stone formation. Therefore this case is certainly interesting.

After careful review I have the following comment:

1) The authors correctly suggested that increased sodium intake caused increased calcium excretion. Their hypothesis that this is the main underlying mechanism for recurrent stone formation is most likely correct. Unfortunately they have never proved it. What is really missing in this case is a 24 hour urine analysis. This would have proven the increased sodium chloride and calcium excretion in the urine and most importantly would have excluded any other abnormality. One might argue that the patient had additional abnormalities needing treatment, for example hypocitraturia due to her bad dietary habits. This was never ruled out. At least, I would like to see a comment on that in the discussion.

2) Reference number 7 is cited third in the manuscript, after references 1 and 2. Please cite the references in the correct order.
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