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MAJOR COMPULSORY REVISIONS

The article from Chinese colleagues is a retrospective review of 31 ovarian fibrosarcoma cases. 13 case is new to be published in Pub Med and remaining 18 patients were previously published in different journals in the literature. With this respect and the number of the cases, the study is unique in the literature for a review process evaluating the diagnostic methods, prognostic factors and treatment options. Therefore, the manuscript should be accepted for publication.

However, the article needs major revision before publication and needs to be revisited after the following major revisions for a final decision;

1. The article is in need of a Professional English editing. Current style is not appropriate for publication. It includes so much grammar, linguistic and syntax errors. It is very hard to read and understand and far from being fluent. There are Professional editors on web and I really insist on such Professional English editing.

2. The order of references is not consecutive. For example on page 3, background section, (1-3), (4) and then (1,2,11)...11 is not in the order. This error is seen in every part of the paragraph and is not acceptable on international publication standards.

3. Methods Section, 2. Paragraph: The authors describe the cases in such a way that the readers may misunderstand. It seems that all the patients are treated and staged by the authors. For example, they say all tumors were staged based on examination, chest X ray, pyelography…etc. They again claim that when there were suspicious findings on chest X ray, CT of chest or brain was carried out. This is wrong. 18 of the cases + 5 Chinese patients does not belong to the authors series. Did all 31 patients have a pyelography?

4. Method Section, 3. Paragraph, the authors say that they have calculated the end points from the date of radical hysterectomy. This is wrong. That should be the date of surgery for their series and a presumed date of surgery in the other 18+5 patients from the literature.

5. Methods section, 4. Paragraph; as an international Standard, there is no free disease survival. That should be Disease Free Survival (DFS). This change must also be done in legends of figures and Tables, in the rest of the manuscript.

6. Pathologic Features; again the authors claim the cut surface of the tumor
showed tan-yellow discoloration and partial necrosis. Microscopically, densely cellular spindle-shaped...These are true for only their cases, not for all 31 patients. How do they know the microscopic features and gross features of the patients picked from the literature. These phrases should be changed accordingly.

7. Discussion section, there is a duplication. The authors again say their results. This sentence should be deleted “In our study, the Ki-67 (MIB-1) proliferation index ranged.....were 100% and 27.2%, respectively (P=..) (2 year......,P=0.076)”

8. Since this is also duplication, please delete the first sentence of the 3. Paragraph of discussion section “Ovarian fibrosarcoma are very rare tumors that originate ......number of patients”

9. The study of Huang et al is 10 years ago. Therefore, the authors should delete recently phrase in this sentence

10. Again, on discussion section, there is a repeat duplication of the same results of treatment. Please delete the 9 lines of the last 10 lines at the end of discussion; “Because of the limited number......with ovary fibrosarcoma compared with BAO/OR/BAO+RT/CT”

11. Please define what does BAO+RT/CT means? Is #t CT or RT; or RT plus CT

12. References are not written according to international standards. For example, in line references 13,14,17 there is (J)..I did not understand what it is? Also, on references 19, 20, 16 there are EPUB..These are Pubmed phrases, not international standards. On reference 13, 17 why don’t you use lower cases? And in reference 13, 17 there are et.al..You should write the whole authors.

13. On Table 1, please only write the surname of the authors. For example not Jaime Prat et al, but instead Pratt et al should be used.

14. On Table 2, the authors shortly write CS as a cytoreductive surgery..These surgeries cannot be accepted as CS..Rather they should obey their original classification BAO.

15. Table 2 and Table 3 include the same variables and should be combined.
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