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Which of the following following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

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?: 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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

In this report, the authors describe a patient who presented with a solitary gingival metastasis from lung carcinoma. The report of gingival metastasis from lung cancer in itself is not new, however, the solitary involvement (no other metastases noted in the body) is original. The authors conclude that such finding could indicate an aggressive behavior rather than an extensive spread of the disease.

Major comments:

1. The authors tagged the tumor as "agressive" due to failure of two chemotherapeutic regimens. The authors should also acknowledge other factors that may have caused failure of therapy (like patient age, tumor size [?delay in diagnosis], etc); especially that pathological evaluation of the primary lung cancer
was not possible.

2. Although the authors’ reasoning may be justified, it is always better to indicate (towards the end of the manuscript) that this is a single case report and no clear diagnostic recommendations can be made based on a single report (considering the solitary gingival metastasis as a direct indicator of aggressive disease). However, the authors call that such lesions in the oral cavity merit thorough evaluation is fully supported.

Minor comments:

1. Introduction, line 9; it is not clear what 30% refers to.
2. I would avoid using references in the conclusion as this should the reflect authors own words.
3. The manuscript needs proofing for linguistics (sentence structure).

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