Reviewer's report

Title: Gastric and duodenal metastases of malign melanoma

Version: 2 Date: 26 May 2010

Reviewer: Carsten Nieder

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?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The following points need to be addressed:
Reference 5 is not mentioned in the text.
Reference 11 and 12 is identical.
Abbreviations are not explained (LAP, GIT etc.).
I would recommend to use the term "female patient" rather than "woman patient".
There is inconsistent use of the terms "malignant melanoma" and "malign melanoma".
Did the patient have B- symptoms?
Please provide details about the patients previous melanoma diagnosis (when?, stage?)
Did the patient receive active treatment, e.g., chemotherapy? Is the outcome known?

I don't agree with the final sentence "Therefore, every metastatic malign melanoma cases should be..." (also in the abstract). Such a policy would subject many patients to unnecessary examinations, which do not alter their management.

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