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PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS: To view the full report from the academic peer reviewer, please see the attached file.

REVIEWER COMMENTS FROM REPORT: The case report is done well and they have attempted to help define the necessary criteria for the appropriate classification for others in the field.

REQUESTED REVISIONS: The manuscript in general is well organized and written. There are however grammatical issues that are present. Specific suggestions for improvement are included below.

1. The title might be more accurate if it was: Malignant perivascular epithelioid cell tumor of the lung synchronous with a primary adenocarcinoma: one case report and review of the literature.

2. Page 2, line 26, "synchronous with a primary adenocarcinoma and describing the dilemma…

3. Page 3, line 34, benign not begin.

4. Page 3, line 35, is extraordinary rare, especially the…

5. Page 3, line 40, gynecologic origin (not capitalized).

6. Page 3, line 45, who synchronously

7. Page 4, line 60, seem to originate

8. Page 4, line 63, HU should be defined here and in abbreviations

9. Page 6, line 89, attention grabbing phenomenon might be replaced with "is highly distinctive".

10. Page 6, line 92, weak but diffusely positive for TFE3 protein…
11. Page 7, line 96, and additional antibodies including neuroendocrine markers.

12. Page 7, line 103, nodules denotes small lesions. 4 cm is not small so I suggest using the word tumors here.

13. Page 7, line 104, courses of chemotherapy of combined…

14. Page 7, line 108, is stable and the patient is followed up regularly.

15. Page 8, line 115, But it is still uncertain what the role of TFE3 is in malignant pulmonary PEComa.

16. Page 8, line 118, Including six case in the English literature and two cases documented in the Chinese literature, …

17. Page 9, line 134, malignant pulmonary PEComa also need to be urgently established.

18. Page 10, line 143, … malignant pulmonary PEComa that we recommend are that the tumor meets 1-2 major diagnostic criteria…

19. Page 10, line 149, ….medical treatment of malignant PEComa is another challenge.

20. Page 11, line 164, Due to this tumor's uncommon occurrence the diagnostic criteria of this entity are not widely known and may lead to misdiagnosis.

21. Page 18, line 270, Another small nodule (give its size here) was located in the left lower lobe with lobulated shape and spicules at its margin.

22. Page 19, line 287, weak but diffuse and consistently positive nuclear staining for TFE3 (B).

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS: see comments above
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

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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