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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: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Comments to authors:

General
The authors report a case of pulmonary artery intimal sarcoma. The patient underwent a local mass resection, but 10 months later the tumor recurred and radiotherapy was performed with relief of the symptoms. Subsequently, liver metastasis developed and transcatheter chemo-embolization was administered. Nevertheless, the patient died of disseminated disease with a total survival of 15 months.

It is of note that in the literature I was not able to find chemo-embolization to treat metastasis in patients affected by this tumor.

The statement that “Radiation therapy … have also not been demonstrated indispensable” is referred to Ref. 1, but the patient reported in this paper had only chemotherapy. While many reported cases had short survival, there are evidences in the literature about effectiveness of adjuvant therapies. In fact, there are published papers (e.g. Head et al. 1992; Burke et al. 1993; Mayer et al. 2001) which present long-term survivors after radical surgery combined with postoperative (without delay) chemotherapy/radiotherapy. The authors state that “intimal sarcoma is a … highly lethal tumor”. This tumor is not necessarily fatal.
The literature has not been extensively reviewed. It is suggested that this paper should be presented as “Case report”, without “and literature review”. However, papers such as this are of interest because they add knowledge about this rare tumor and may indicate treatments, which, to date, have not yet been well defined.

Revisions necessary for publication

- In Case Presentation the authors refer that “no abnormalities were detected in abdomen”. This affirmation was based on a clinical evidence or was it confirmed by computed tomography or echography?
- It should be clarified if the tumor was completely resected or not.
- In Discussion, delete the phrase “Radiation therapy … have also not been demonstrated indispensable”. Also, par. 3 line 4, change “patients” in patient.
- Ref. 2. Change the names of the authors in: Ozbek C, Emrecan B, Calli AO, and Gurbuz A.
- Ref. 5. Change the names of the authors in: Choi EY, Yoon YW, Kwon HM, Kim D, Park BE, Hong YS, Koo JS, Kim TH, Kim HS.
- Ref. 9. Mattoo instead of “Matoroo”.

What next?: Revise and resubmit

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