






BMJ Case Reports

Clinical Case Report reviewer guidance

Thank you for taking the time to review this case report for BMJ Case Reports. We appreciate your time and interest in reviewing this manuscript.

-  The most important feature in the manuscript is whether the authors have provided the clinical evidence from which they draw their conclusions and construct their learning points.
-  The rationale and details of treatment should meet agreed clinical standards.
-  All patient details, including exact age, ethnicity, occupation and location should be anonymised.
-  Where surgical procedures are described, we favour short (maximum 5 minutes) annotated videos.
-  Authors are asked to present information using original diagrams, flowcharts and tables.

While reviewing the manuscript, please, consider the following general questions in your response to the editor:

Are the authors' conclusions and learning points in the manuscript supported by the clinical information in the manuscript?	
Claims based on a single case should be carefully considered. Have the authors provided sufficient evidence to support their claims of an association, cause, or response to treatment?	
BMJ Case Reports does not publish manuscripts that describe the efficacy or effectiveness of new treatments or lifestyle changes, and does not publish the results of phase II, ongoing clinical trials, or off-label use of medication. Does the manuscript describe any of these scenarios?	
Are there any concerns about the management of the patient? e.g. is there evidence of negligence or poor care decisions?	
Are there any concerns about the standard of writing or presentation of data? Is there a timeline of clinical events? Is language correction needed? Has formal, scientific and neutral vocabulary been used? Are results of investigations presented optimally?	

Are there concerns that content has been plagiarised or generated by AI?	
Are the references provided by the author current, accurate, and relevant to each corresponding statement in the manuscript?	
Are the images properly deidentified?	

While reviewing the manuscript, please, consider the following questions about the manuscript template:

Title: Is the title a straightforward clinical title that includes the diagnosis?	
Summary: Is the summary distinct from the background section? Is it an effective description of what may be learned from the case?	
Background: Does the background set the context of the case?	
Clinical presentation: Is all the clinical information relevant to the case presented? Are signs and symptoms and the timeline of events fully and effectively described? Would the addition of a diagrammatic timeline help?	
Investigations: Are the clinical rationale and interpretation of results fully explained? Is this section written in prose? Have correct international units been used? Would adding a table or graph help?	
Treatment: Has the treatment been described in adequate detail? Does the dosing of medication make sense? Have changes in dosing or frequency been explained? Are non-medication treatments fully described (physical therapy, occupational therapy, behavioural therapies...)	
Outcome and follow up: Have the effects and pitfalls of treatment been fully addressed. Is the follow up sufficient? Is it clear how well the patient is recovered and how they are living with disease, disability and the effects of ongoing treatment?	
Discussion: Is up-to-date literature reliably discussed and referenced? Are the conclusions supported by the clinical description and scientific literature? Are the authors' claims suitably tempered? Single cases cannot demonstrate associations, causes or efficacy of treatments.	
Learning points: Are the learning points supported by the clinical description? Is each learning point written in the present tense. Does each learning point stand alone and make sense even without reading the rest of the manuscript?	

<p>References: Does each reference accurately support the corresponding statement made by the authors? Has the most relevant and recent reference been used? Is each reference from a reliable source (especially where an Internet link is provided)? Have all the references been cited in journal style? The journal uses the Vancouver style of referencing.</p>	
<p>Images: Are there images of the patient's face? Have all patient identifiers been removed? Is the image of sufficient quality? Is the image fully annotated for readers to understand? Would an accompanying diagram assist the readers' understanding?</p>	
<p>Videos: Have all patient identifiers been removed? Is the patient's face visible? Is the video narrated and/or annotated? Are structures labelled?</p>	
<p>Patient perspective: is this in the patient's own words? Is there a description of what it has been like for the patient to experience illness, treatment and convalescence? Is there a description of what life is like for the patient after treatment? Is the patient identifiable from the patient perspective? We do not publish single sentence expressions of thanks from patients to the doctors/authors.</p>	