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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?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

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

Comments to authors:

General
Although the case report is well written and illustrated, I don't think that it represents a cystic mucinous neoplasm. The imaging shows a solid mass, the gross picture shows a mucinous tumor but it is not cystic enough to be called a cystic and solid neoplasm (although there are microcysts). The 2004 WHO classification of lung tumors is not used (rather the authors chose to reference the 1999 one). Based on the images and description provided, I would call this a mucinous adenocarcinoma. Thus this case report only adds to the confusion in terminology.

Revisions necessary for publication

What next?: Reject

Quality of written English: Acceptable