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Reviewer’s report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic? Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns?

Comments: No ethical concerns. Informed consent was obtained.

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

The introduction is limited to PCT (which is then again extensively referred on the discussion); it does not refer the difficulty of the diagnosis, other differential diagnosis, more common diseases, challenges when approaching skin lesions and liver function abnormalities, it goes directly to this rare entity. I think it would be more interesting to focus on differential diagnosis. Besides, when referring PCT, it could be more accurate (for instances when referring that PCT is "an acquired disease and sometimes genetic" -- It would be preferable to divide in sporadic (type 1) or familial (type 2 and 3) and refer epidemiology of different types

4. Does the article report the following information?

a. The relevant patient information, including:

   - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity) - There is no reference about ethnicity

   - Main symptoms of the patient - Yes

   - Medical, family and psychosocial history - Yes, still, no reference to HCV or HIV status, medication, no sentence excluding other relevant medical history.

   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes - Yes

b. The relevant physical examination findings - Yes
c. Important dates and times in this case - Yes

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods - Yes
   - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural) - n/a

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

No, there is reference to phlebotomy treatment every two weeks, but it does not specify for how long and no follow-up is mentioned. What happened to the patient?

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

Discussion - Yes, still it would be interesting to start the discussion with a reference to the case itself, in order to add more value to the case (as in how interesting it was, or how well it went because the diagnosis was considered, etc).

Also, I suggest mentioning relevant aspects of the case during discussion, for instance:

   - When referring to susceptibility factors, the relationship with alcohol (which you made in introduction but I personally think it would be more enriching here), for instance: The patient registered a high alcohol intake. PCT has been related to alcohol abuse as well with - and refer to other susceptibility factors.

   - When referring the typical skin lesions, start by the skin lesions presented by the patient, mention that it was typical for PCT as well as - and mention other lesions.

Conclusion - "PCT is usually overlooked and should be remembered in differential diagnosis of liver disease with typical skin involvement" - there is no reference to differential diagnosis through the article. "Decrease morbidity and health costs with possible early treatment" - no reference through the article despite being true.

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: yes, though I suggest rewriting according to the suggestions mentioned above on the different sections (introduction, discussion, conclusion). I suggest to write the complete name of the enzyme instead of "urrod enzyme" once it is the first reference.
8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: It does because it is a rare disease, though, the presentation was very common and suggestive of PCT, there was no apparent treatment challenge nor follow up showing it was a good treatment choice.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

Both grammar and sentence organization should be reviewed, there are errors in almost every sentences though I understood the main idea through the text. Starting by the title.

I believe you have a good case of a rare disease, the collected information is consistent and correct. I think that if you review the writing and the introduction you can make it much more interesting for the reader.

Hope to see your rewriting soon.
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