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Reviewer’s report:

General
After the read of the revised manuscript of Authors I offer the following considerations for publication.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1) Fig 1 C is not adequate to demonstrate the metastasis of endometrial carcinoma into a lymph node. I think that this image could correspond to histological section of neoplasm, at high magnification. It is necessary to show a more convincing images which can reveal at low and high magnification that the figure corresponds to cytological specimen. Moreover, the presence of lymphoid cells is indispensable to demonstrate metastatic nature of lesion.

2) To demonstrate lymphonodal metastasis I have suggested an immunohistochemical analysis with Ca-125 marker. Cox-2 performed by Authors is not adequate, because this marker results positive in neoplasms of other sites, too.

3) Only few cases of adenomyosis undergo malignant transformation. Why? The Authors should respond to this question, although this is not the initial aim of their work. To respond to this question, I have suggested to evaluate P53 and Cox-2 immunoreactivity. The immunoreactivity to COX-2 which have been considered is not discussed in terms of carcinogenetic event by authors. Only adenomyotic foci with p53 mutation subiscono a neoplastic transformation (see previous references indicate in previous referee’s report). Only hyperestrogenic environment is not sufficient to explain the neoplastic transformation. I think that demonstrating this, your work becomes more complete, more interesting and will can be published. Other author already have demonstrated that leyomioma represents hyperestrogenic environment, thus your work do not add other new information to literature.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound

Level of interest: An article of insufficient interest to warrant publication in a scientific/medical journal

Quality of written English: Acceptable

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