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Reviewer's report:

I the case report submitted Dr. Verschoor and colleagues present a patient with endometrial stromal sarcoma who was serially rechallenged with pazopanib after hepatotoxicity. Overall the article is clearly written and potentially relevant to the journal readership. I would offer the following comments for consideration in a revised version:

1. Line 18 in background should be changed to temporarily

2. Remove "in" from line 4 of the case

3. What happened to the liver enzymes after challenged again at 400mg PO Daily pazopanib (line 7, page 9)? This should be clarified, and also why this dose (400mg PO Daily) was chosen after prior LFT increase on 200mg PO Daily and pneumothorax on 200mg PO every other day. The thought process here would be helpful for the reader to understand, and this certainly deviates from the guidance on the approved label.

4. Was biopsy considered at the time of progression after ifosfamide? Some mention or understands of whether the high grade component is what progressed would be informative in putting this case in the context of the management of ESS.

5. Lines 4-7 on page 11 (discussion) are somewhat misleading. In reading it seems as though the authors are suggesting their case overexpressed KIT as has been seen in other YWHAE-FAM22 fusion+ ESS, however, the authors do not present KIT IHC data nor note in the case presentation. This should be clarified and is perhaps a grammatical error.

6. The authors should be more clear that their dosing strategy significantly differs from the guidance, and perhaps suggest a monitoring strategy if clinicians plan to deviate from the label. Would the authors advise weekly, 2x week LFTs in this situation? I believe the conclusion could be tempered with a cautious statement noting the above.
7. The resolution in figure 3 is poor in the provided pdf

8. The authors should note in the case if the patient had any LFT changes on chemo, known baseline liver disease, or hepatic mets. It appears from figure 3 that baseline LFTs were normal though this should be overtly stated in the case.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Unable to assess

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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