PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is an interesting case, but I have a few comments. 1) The authors write that "The patient denied any family history.", but the patient is a 48-day-old boy who cannot speak. Therefore, it is more correct to write that "the patient's parents deny any family history." 2) The authors write "10 items of prenatal and postnatal care, 6 items of immunity". Please specify which ones. 3) Please, spell out all the abbreviations and give the norms for laboratory indicators.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Very good [ ] Grade C: Good
	[ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing
	[ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [Y] Accept (General priority)
	[ ] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No

| Peer-reviewer statements | Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous   [   ] Onymous |
| | Conflicts-of-Interest: [   ] Yes   [Y] No |

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The Authors present an instructive case of congenital diabetes insipidus AVPR2 gene mutation at a new site with diarrhea symptoms in a baby. The case is well presented and documented. Although with all the limitations of any case report, I think it deserves dissemination.   two minor comments: - can the Authors expand on the treatment and follow-up plan? - some English polishing is necessary