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I am familiar with the literature and believe that this case meets one of the 7 criteria for evaluation in the journal: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: No

Comments to authors:

1. KS of the hand not related to HIV infection has been described previously in the literature.
2. The clinical differential of this lesion would include other tumors including AFX, melanoma, epithelioid sarcoma, Merkel cell carcinoma, DFSP, vascular tumors (e.g. hemangiopericytoma), other sarcomas, etc. To infer that it mimicks only SCC as a major premise of your article is not supported by the clinical picture.
3. Figure 2 reference should be moved up to the preceeding sentence.
4. Figure 3 is non-contributory.
5. In the introduction paragraph, 5th sentence, I believe you meant to put "common" before neoplasm.
6. In the Case Presentation section, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence, I believe you need to put an "H" on the first word.
7. All abbreviations should to be identified with a key.
8. The 8th paragraph in the Discussion section is only one sentence.
9. In the Discussion section, 11th paragraph, 2nd sentence, would replace "suffer
from" with "have". In the next sentence, would replace "Patients requiring" with "Some patients require" and then eliminate "can be easily identified".

10. Discussion section, 12th paragraph is confusing and doesn't flow well with paragraph 11.

11. Discussion section, paragraph 13, first sentence is confusing.

It is an interesting case but probably not worth publishing unless the relevance is elucidated and a more articulate discussion is presented.

What next?: Revise and resubmit

Quality of written English: Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited