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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: I didn't have any ethical concerns, and a written consent is already obtained from the patient and is available for review by the Editor-in-Chief of this journal.

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   Yes, but there is few words need correction. Page No 3; line 45; delays in development should be corrected to delayed development. Also, said abnormalities; is a not known word.

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): yes.
      - Main symptoms of the patient: yes, they are mentioned well.
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history: yes, it is mentioned well.
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes: no H/O previous interventions.

   b. The relevant physical examination findings: the author missed measuring the span of the patient and facial features.

   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: No dates are mentioned.

   d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
      - Diagnostic methods: mentioned well.
      - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural): not applicable.
      - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable: they are not mentioned; as the case need follow up in both clinical and laboratory measures. Also, the author didn't do HCG (Human chorionic gonadotropin) test; that is an important test for evaluation of testicular functions.

   e. Types and mechanism of intervention: well mentioned.
f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits: the follow-up visits didn't mentioned.

Comments: the history is well covered; including demographic data, main symptoms of the patient, medical, family and psychosocial, and relevant past interventions. As regards to physical examination; the authors missed measuring the span of the patient didn't mention his facial features. Diagnostic measures are mentioned well, while the reasoning and prognostic characteristics are not mentioned. Also, the author didn't do HCG (Human chorionic gonadotropin) test; that is an important test for evaluation of testicular functions. Intervention, both medical and surgical is mentioned well. No follow up visits are mentioned.

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
Comments: The Conclusion is not balanced as the author again mentioned part of the patient presentation in the conclusion, while the discussion is well balanced.

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, the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature as the patient didn't have tall stature.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
please correct the errors of syntax and grammar. Also the abstract is written in two different manners, that in abstract section is very short; while it is written well in the manuscript.
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