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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: Findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

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?: Yes

Comments to authors:

- The paper would improve if the authors present the histological specimen from the primary tumor, the recurrent pelvic tumor and the pulmonary nodules. It would be interesting to see if the specimen look similar, especially the mitotic rates.

- The case would be more detailed if the authors present the CT/MRI scans. The figure shown in the manuscript is from low quality and not informative.

Discussion:

The authors should structure the discussion stringently (i.e. incidence, pathology, diagnosis, therapeutical possibilities, explanation for the chosen treatment regimen). This part is a little bit confusing. It does not become clear, what the authors want to tell the reader, esp. what is the new and therefore interesting message of the case.

Please clarify and/or shorten the part.

Egberts et al, 2006 give an overview on the disease. Please check and cite it in the discussion.
What next?: Revise and resubmit

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