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Reviewer's report

Title: Vanishing liver lesions during follow-up after bleomycin-based treatment for non-seminoma testis: a case-report

Version: 1 Date: 22 February 2013

Reviewer: Gerald Pühse

Reviewer's report:

There are no major compulsory revisions.

Minor Essential Revisions: Please change "Conclusions" (page 5) into "Discussion" (there is already a conclusion at the end of the case report.

The title of the chapter has been changed as the reviewer indicates.

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.

Declaration of competing interests: 'I declare that I have no competing interests'
Reviewer's report

Title: Vanishing liver lesions during follow-up after bleomycin-based treatment for non-seminoma testis: a case-report

Version: 1 Date: 18 June 2013

Reviewer: Mutahir Tunio

Reviewer's report:

It is excellent report presented by authors; however needs clarification in following points.

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major comments

1. Title of case report is confusing for readers as it lacks clarification that you are talking about eosinophilic hepatic lesion or metastatic nodule

   The title has been changed as the reviewer indicates.

2. Whether this patient underwent broncho-alveolar lavage? Worth to mention in case presentation.

   Thank you for your suggestion. However, a broncho-alveolar lavage was not performed. We have added this remark in the article.

3. There is direct a conclusion part after case presentation without discussion

   We agree with the reviewer and have rearranged the text for a clear discussion part after the case presentation.

4. It would be worth wise to discuss differential diagnosis of metastatic and eosinophilic hepatic nodules

   We agree with the reviewer and have included a table specifying the differential diagnosis between both diseases.

5. If there were radiologic signs of eosinophilic pneumonitis. At that point if
steroids would started patient could not develop lesions into liver? Kindly comment

This is indeed a good suggestion. We have added a comment regarding this hypothesis.

Minor revisions

1. Discussion needs flow. In current form it is confusing and it would be nice to emphasize more on hepatic lesions in presence of eosinophilia

We have reshaped the text somewhat in order to emphasize more the hepatic lesions.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

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

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

Declaration of competing interests: No Conflict of interest to disclose