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Reviewer's report

Title: Intra-articular angioleiomyoma of the knee with an atypical finding of Gd-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging: a case report

Version: 1 Date: 23 February 2014

Reviewer: Tadashi Tanaka

Comments to authors:

General comments

The manuscript entitled “Intra-articular angioleiomyoma of the knee with an
atypical finding of Gd-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging: a case report” seeks to report a rare case of angioleiomyoma that showed unusual MRI findings. There was a considerable interest in this paper, but the reviewer has concluded that it cannot be accepted in its current form unless the authors respond to the reviewer’s comments in a revised version of the manuscript.

Specific comments

1. Abstract,
   a. Conclusions: the reviewer feels that the content of “Conclusions” is rather inadequate. The sentences of “After the surgery, the patient,,,,,an atypical finding of Gd-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging” seem to be in “Case Presentation”.
   The conclusion has been changed as the reviewer’s indicates.

b. The reviewer is wondering if the conclusions might be something like: (1) a rare type of angioleiomyoma exists, (2) the lesion may reveal atypical finding of MRI, but it can help the diagnosis,,,,,. Please clarify the authors’ opinion and revise it if necessary.
   I correct the sentence to “To know the atypical MRI findings, such as in this case, may be useful in the differential diagnosis of intra-articular tumor”.

2. Discussion, 4th -3rd lines to the last: it is a little incomprehensible. Please check the sentence of “,,,,,with recurrence of a case not being reported in the literature” Please also check English grammar in terms of use of definite and indefinite articles or other points for more sophisticated manuscript.
   The sentences of the discussion has been changed as the reviewer indicates.

3. References, [6]: The names of the authors are wrong. They should be “Okubo Y, Kotake K,,,,,”.
   We corrected it as indicated by the reviewer.

   Quality of written English:Needs some language corrections before being published
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Reviewer's report

Title: Intra-articular angioleiomyoma of the knee with an atypical finding of Gd-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging: a case report

Version: 1 Date: 15 February 2014

Reviewer: Atsuya Watanabe

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

Comments to authors:

COMMENTS:

Summary:
The authors reported a rare case of angioleiomyoma occurred intra-articularly in the knee and with atypical MRI Imaging.

General comment:
This case report is generally interesting, and the text is mostly concise and clearly written. However there are some changes which the authors may consider.

Major weakness
The correlation between histology and MRI finding observed in this report was not well discussed. Please go more into detail of the MRI finding, and correlate with histology of the mass.
We have corrected the contents of the discussion as the reviewer indicates.

Specific comments
1. Introduction
   a) Reference number 2 is missing.
   We corrected.

   b) Line 4-: Please provide a more detailed description of the MRI sequences used in this study.
   We added about the MRI sequences in the figure1 and figure2 captions.

   c) Line 5-: Please correct into "have been reported in English
   We corrected.

   d) Line 6-: Why the atypical MRI image help preoperative diagnosis? Please clarify.
   We corrected.
2. Case presentation
a) Line 3-: “Routine radiography showed no remarkable findings (Figure 1)”
   Figure 1 is missing.
   We corrected that figure1 is about MRI.

b) Line 8-: Was the Gd-enhanced MRI performed just to accurately study the extent of the mass? Please provide a clear purpose and a utility of Gd-enhanced in this particular case.
   We performed a Gd-enhanced MRI for differential diagnosis including malignant tumor, and to accurately study the extent of the mass.

c) Line -11: The authors may consider summarizing the differential diagnosis of the mass on MRI. I am not sure how strong the diagnosis “angioleiomyoma” on MRI can be.
   We added the sentences into the discussion about differential diagnosis.

d) Line 11-: As the mass occurred intra-articularly, arthroscopic findings or images are important. Please provide. Please provide the reasons why total excision using arthroscopy was not possible.
   We added the sentences about arthroscopic findings into the case presentation.

e) Line 19: Which follow up has been conducted? Clinical? MRI? US?
   We followed up the patient by the clinical and MRI findings.

f) In microscopic examination, the tumor comprised numerous blood vessels of various sizes. On the other hand, in Gd-enhanced MRI, enhancement was observed only in the peripheral area. Please explain the discrepancy between these results in discussion section.
   We added the sentences into the discussion about it.

3. Discussion
a) The discussion unfortunately remains on the surface. Please go more into detail of the utility of Gd-enhancement in diagnosing the “intra-articular angioleiomyoma”.
   We corrected it to “The mass showed an atypical findings of MRI including Gd-enhanced imaging comparing to previously reported intra-articular lesions. This tumor is difficult to diagnose prior to surgery due to paucity of information”.

b) Again, the correlation between histology and MRI finding observed in this report was not well discussed. Please discuss the MRI finding in this particular case, and correlate with histology of the mass.
   We added the sentences into the discussion about it.

4. Conclusion
a) The purpose of the manuscript which is expressed in the conclusion is not so clear. It looks like that if an orthopaedic surgeon finds a lesion with an atypical behavior at Gd-enhanced MRI, it could even be an angioleiomyoma because the present case is different from all the others previously described.

Please clarify.
We correct it.

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests..