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1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? I think the title is too long. That's why I recommend shortening it.

2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? It is prepared just like a review. Therefore, it should be rewritten according to the case report format.

3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? It is appropriate to the content of the topic.

4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Looking at the WJCC manual, it appears that the introduction should begin with "Introduction".

5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? Case reports were written in an appropriate format. However, subheadings should be written in bold font.

6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? The case report is appropriately written.
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