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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: An unexpected event in the course of observing or treating a patient

Has the case been reported coherently?: No

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

In general it is a paper with good observation. The discussion was interesting. A few points need to be clarified. First of all, the exact timing of 'lung and mediastinal recurrence' was not mentioned clearly. Is there any histological prove that it was indeed a recurrence? A picture of associated CT thorax was provided, but the characteristic of the lesions were not defined. How about tumor marker and its trend during the course of treatment? Secondly, transcatheter arterial embolization of mediastinal tumor was attempted before RT, but 'it failed to take effect'. What should be expected after such procedure and the time course of effect? What was the meaning of 'it failed to take effect so there was a possibility of spinal artery embolism'? Furthermore, if it was a lung recurrence involvement both mediastinum and lung parenchyma, what was the rational of RT to mediastinum only and the intent of treatment? In page 6, it briefly mentioned that
there was another LN swelling around left gastric artery few years later (by calculation, it was 4 years later?), and the lesion disappeared after RT and there was no more recurrence since then. What was the lesion? 'Recurrence' after 4 years of HCC with known systemic involvement is not typical.

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