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Author’s response to reviews: see over
Dear JMCR Editorial Team,

thank you very much for mailing the Deputy Editor's comments to our Case Report.

Please find enclosed our manuscript, which we revised according to his suggestions and our point-by-point responses to the concerns. All amendments in the manuscript were highlighted in blue.

Please let me know if there is any further information required.

I am looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Prof. Dr. Dr. Jürgen Scheele
Response to Deputy Editor's Comments:

1) The Introduction section is rather long and some of this material is best suited for the Discussion section.
   We inserted now a Discussion section and moved some paragraphs from the Introduction within the Discussion section.

2) The Case presentation section contains information that is best moved to the Discussion section. The Case presentation should just be used to report the details of the case.
   We shortened also the Case Presentation section and moved some parts in the new Discussion section.

3) The manuscript does not have a Discussion section. Please would the authors add this section. Much of the current content of the Introduction, a few paragraphs from the Case Presentation and Conclusion section could be reorganised into an interesting Discussion section.
   We reorganized the manuscript and inserted now a Discussion section, in which we discuss some points from the Introduction, Case Presentation and Conclusion section.

4) The Conclusion section should be short and to the point, including only the main messages that the authors wish to convey about their case report.
   We reduced the Conclusion section; now only the main messages of this case report can be found within this section.

5) This patient was taking part in a trial, please would the authors acknowledge this in an Acknowledgments section as readers may be interested to hear of such a trial.
   Recruitment into the trial has been completed. Therefore the trial is not open any more.

6) In page 3 of their response to the peer-reviewers, in reply to question 2 the authors explain the reasons why the patient declined sorafenib. Please would they include this reason in their manuscript.
   We inserted this short explanation now in the Case Presentation section.

In addition to the Deputy Editor's comments, please also include the ethnicity of the patient in the abstract section of the manuscript to fully conform to the journal style.
   We mention the patient's ethnical background now in the Abstract section.