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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unreported or unusual side effects or adverse interactions involving medications

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 manuscript seems worth publishing because it highlights an important aspect in the differential diagnosis of patients presenting with soft tissue-like pulmonary masses. The case report would be more convincing should the authors have included a follow-up CT scan that would demonstrate the resolution of the radiographic findings. A bronchoscopic image, if available, would also add to the point made by the authors. The manuscript could still be published “as it is” if these information cannot be provided.
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