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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?: No

Is this case worth reporting?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: No

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?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

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.

Specific comments
Introduction
Reference number 2 is missing.

Line 4-: Please provide a more detailed description of the MRI sequences used in this study.

Line 5-: Please correct into "have been reported in English

Line 6-: Why the atypical MRI image help preoperative diagnosis? Please clarify.

Case presentation
Line 3-: “Routine radiography showed no remarkable findings (Figure 1)” Figure 1 is missing.

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.

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.

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.

Line 19: Which follow up has been conducted? Clinical? MRI? US?

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.

Discussion
The discussion unfortunately remains on the surface. Please go more into detail of the utility of Gd-enhancement in diagnosing the “intra-articular angioleiomyoma”.

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.

Conclusion
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.

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