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Which of the 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?: No

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: No

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

This case reports an isolated splenic metastasis from a carcinosarcoma, presumably of gynaecological origin. There is one large omission in that the pathology of the initial tumour resected previously is not reported nor is the duration of time between that initial resection and the presumed recurrence. This is critical information and if possible a review of the initial pathology would be beneficial.

My other more minor criticism is the discussion of the multiclonal theory of the aetiology of carcinosarcoma; the literature is now heavily behind the monoclonal theory of development of these tumours.

Other than this, if pathology review confirms the primary tumour to be an ovarian carcinosarcoma then this report merits publication. If pathology review confirms an epithelial ovarian tumour as the primary then revision should include a
discussion of this and the fact that the splenic lesion may have arisen from this or may be a primary splenic carcinosarcoma.

There are a number of spelling/grammatical errors/ambiguities/omissions that should be corrected:
1) Abstract line 1: 'metastatic tumors of the spleen' would be better as 'metastatic tumors to the spleen'
2) Abstract line 2: 'ther' should be 'other'
3) Ambiguity in abstract line 3: do you mean carcinosarcomas of the spleen or carcinosarcomas metastasising to the spleen?
4) Final line of abstract: do you mean arising from a primary ovarian carcinosarcoma or arising from a primary ovarian carcinoma?
5) The abstract should mention the previous primary ovarian mass.
6) Grammar: last sentence of abstract would read better if it was changed to splenic metastasis from metastatic spleen.
7) Last line of abstract: 'pathlogy' should be 'pathology'.
8) Introduction line 3: 'hematagenous' should be 'hematogenous'.
9) Introduction line 4: spelling of 'metastasis/metastases' (latter would be better) is incorrect.
10) Intro line 6: 'metastasis' should be pleural.
11) Intro line 7: grammar; sentence construction could be improved.
12) 4th last line of introduction: add 'serous' in front of 'cystadenocarcinoma'.
13) Last sentence of clinical summary: 'consistent of ovarian origin' should be changed to 'consistent with ovarian origin'.
14) 8th sentence of discussion would be more accurate if phrase 'other than melanoma' was added after 'sources'.
15) 9th sentence of discussion: 'as' would be better changed to 'being'.
16) 10th sentence of discussion: 'has been' would be better as 'is'.

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