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Reviewer’s report:

Review of Volkow et al.

The authors describe a case of transplant-associated KS, quite extensive, that fails to resolve with use of traditional chemotherapy, radiotherapy, and gancyclovir, although there is some response. Treatment with imatinib resulted in dramatic worsening of KS and overall deterioration. Finally, the patient received sirolimus with dramatic improvement of KS.

Comments

1. I found the description of the clinical course long and hard to follow. It would be useful to include a table that shows important dates, immunosuppressive regimen, KS treatments, and the degree of involvement of KS. This would provide a simple and clear description of the chronology, and it allow the authors to focus on the points they wish to make.

2. The discussion of the case in the context of prior clinical studies is too superficial. The authors should describe in more detail the clinical data (case reports or case series) regarding use of imatinib and sirolimus. For example, the paper by Stallone at all in NEJM was a detailed description of clinical responses in a large number of transplant patients treated with sirolimus, along with other data on pathology of the KS lesions, but the present authors state only that the clinical outcome was “outstanding.”

3. Are there data supporting the use of gancyclovir in transplant-associated KS? This drug might have activity against replicating human herpesvirus 8 (HHV8), but how important is viral replication in KS? Do the authors have any data on HHV8 viral load in their patient, and viral load response to gancyclovir?

4. The authors should more clearly describe the pathogenesis of KS and potential mechanism of action of these drugs. I found the present discussion superficial, confusing, and too thinly referenced.

5. There are a number of spelling and grammatical errors in the manuscript.

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No