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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

*It is an interesting case report and is well written. *There is no histopathological picture of the diagnosis of adenocarcinoma. *Also, there is no image of abdominal CT preoperatively. *What is the definition of persistent fever after surgery? Does it mean the patient developed fever since postoperative hours, day 1? And how much did it reach? Was it in the same period of the leukocytosis at day 1 postop? *No need to repeat sputum culture in (microbiological identification of the causative agent) since it was mentioned in (laboratory examination) *In follow-up part, wen was meglumine diatrizoate esophagogram was done? Is it the same day 23 to clamp the anastomotic leak? If it is the same, just place it as one paragraph because it is a bit confusing *Mention (figure2) in the text. It is only mentioned as legend Thank you
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Although this is an interesting and well-managed case, the authors are drawing too many conclusions from a case report. They should potentially consider a systematic review in order for the findings to have a more evidence-based basis.