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Reviewer's report:

The authors describe their experience in surgical treatment of a patient with encapsulating peritoneal sclerosis occurring 15 months after HIPEC.

Comments:

#1. The rationale for hyperthermic IP 5-FU is unclear as minimal drug penetration of only 0.2 mm and no thermal enhancement has been reported suggesting that 5-FU is not effective in the context of HIPEC but maybe normothermic or bidirectional regimens.

#2: The indication for HIPEC in this patient should be discussed. A patient with an UICC stage II cancer without lymph node infiltration and without peritoneal disease does not seem to be at high risk for developing PM.

#3: Most reports show sclerosis after several applications of IPC corresponding to the effect seen during CAPD. The possible reasons for EPS after singular HIPEC application might be discussed. Where there any risk factors in this patient? Where there any signs of (subclinical) peritonitis during the postoperative course or follow-up?

#4: A sclerosing effect of doxorubicin is well known if doses higher than 15 mg/sqm body surface are used. Thus, the dependence of EPS on the drug regimen should be discussed.

#5: page 7, line 96f: This sentence does not make sense and should be revised.

#6: page 7, line 89: There are great series including a French clinical trial with programmed surgical revision and 2nd or 3rd CRS/HIPEC procedures showing no higher rates of EPS. Thus, this sentence should be deleted from the revised manuscript as 30-40 % is definitely too high.

page 8, line 108: Did you mean overall morbidity rate?

page 4, line 27: This trial has been published as a phase I NOT phase II study.

page 4, line 30: There are numerous publications regarding overall morbidity and mortality after CRS/HIPEC. The morbidity rates of about 30 % and the presence of numerous reports should be mentioned in the revised manuscript.
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