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Reviewer's report:

General
In this case report, Jones et al. report on an unusual case of giant perineal keloids and its successful treatment with surgery followed by radiation therapy. The case is unusual because the female genital region is one in which keloids do not normally form. However, this patient had a 29-year history of spontaneous keloid formation (since she was 5 years old) and presented with a giant perineal tumor. The report is of interest because of this unusual location and the evidence from the family history that it may represent a familial case and should be published, but the authors should be asked to revise the report before publication, as follows:

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

(1) The authors should make clear whether the mother and sister of the patient, also affected with keloids, had perineal keloids like the patient. Whether both mother and sister had arthritic symptoms as well as diabetes should also be made clear.
(2) In the conclusion section the authors need to revise the statements about the study of Marneros et al. Marneros et al. did not, as described, use X-chromosomal markers for genotyping; they did a genome-wide screen with polymorphic markers to identify two distinct gene loci which may contain specific susceptibility genes.
(3) The authors refer to a study of Ragoowansi et al. but did not include this in the reference list. This must be corrected.
(4) Several minor typographical changes need to be corrected, including the formatting for reference 26 in the text, and the variable placement of references before and after the period at the end of sentences.

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)

(1) If possible, the authors should be encouraged to add more information about the family to further support the conclusion that this is indeed a case of inherited keloids.