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Reviewer's report:

The authors present a very informative, well-written and balanced article on a large SFT series of their institution. To my knowledge this is the largest series so far presented as a full paper.

Question is well defined, methods appropriate, data sound, well-reported, balanced, limitations stated and well referenced.

Title and abstract describe the work well and the article good to read.

Minor Essential Revisions

Abstract:
I would rephrase:
Four patients (36%) were progression-free for more than 6 months. Two patients receiving pazopanib were without progression at 6 and 8 months and both patients receiving sunitinib at 30 months.

I would strongly recommend to then delete the very last sentence.

First Line Treatment - please rephrase/reorganize:
For example:
Of the 30 patients, 3 received RT, 2 surgery, 2 Imatinib and 23 first-line chemo. Then go into details.

RT 3
Surgery 2
GIST 2
Chemo 23

I would very much prefer a more complete table 2, showing all available data on a given patient, i.e. primary site, outcome of first surgery, delay diagnosis-adv disease, 1/2/3/4 line of tx, OS (and/or even PFS)

This would better allow to follow what happened to a given patient and allow the reader a better analysis of the trial patients outcome.

Table 3 and paragraphs "other lines of therapy" / "response to antiangiogenic tx"
Please check patient numbers:
In the text you talk of 6 pts receiving pazopanib and 5 sunitinib, but in the "breakdown" I count only 5 and 4, respectively. Table 3 let's me guess that the "missing" one patient each might be hidden in the "other investigational agent" but it might simply just be a typo either.

Would shorten or rephrase:
Intro -
.....identify SFT as a distinctive entity. While ..... 
.....follows a benign clinical course. Nevertheless...... 
.....advanced inoperable SFT managed at our institution with standard.....

Figures:
I would strongly recommend/suggest to combine Figures 2A/B and 3 showing three curves "OTHER", "Doxo-containing (mono or combination)" , TKIs.

Some typos:
Abstract - patients and methods is "double"; we / We;
Introduction
2nd page top - several CASE reports (later you use case-reports, pick one version)
mid first page: ...(lung, meninges, thigh, thyroid, ETC.)
Results - First Line end: ultrasoudn guideD biopsy
Discussion end: more sensitive THAN other subtypes
Table 2 and text: "rachis" you might want to use SPINE

A question regarding table 2. The number in brackets behind surgery: does it denotes how many times a patient underwent surgery ?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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