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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: No concerns

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

Yes/No  SEE BELOW

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

SEE BELOW

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:

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

Comments:

SEE BELOW

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:

SEE BELOW

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

Comments:
9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

This case report of a PCT patient is not particularly remarkable. PCT is the most common porphyria, and a new case report in the literature should have some remarkable features or include some new scientific observations to justify bringing its attention to a worldwide audience. This case has no new or notable features. Also, it is an incomplete report, without good documentation of the diagnosis. English usage is awkward and there are many spelling errors.

Some specific comments:

1. Page 3, line 39. Elevation of urine porphyrins and normal porphobilinogen is not sufficient to establish a diagnosis of PCT. It is necessary to fractionate the urine porphyrins, and show a predominance of highly carboxylate porphyrins (uroporphyrin and hepta-, hexa-, and pentacarboxyl porphyrin). Also, it is advisable to measure erythrocyte porphyrins and be sure they are normal or only modestly elevated, since mild, late onset cases of congenital erythropoietic porphyria (CEP) can mimic PCT.

2. Line 43. Response of the patient to phlebotomies should be mentioned.

3. Page 4, last paragraph. Should describe how these procedures were done to exclude porphyrias other than PCT in this case. A case report should provide an example of the full diagnostic workup.

4. Page 5, line 32. It is not likely that chloroquine and hydroxychloroquine act by depleting iron.

5. The photograph doesn't show any lesions clearly.

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

An article of limited interest

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

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?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.

I declare that I have no competing interests

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal

Were you mentored through this peer review?

No