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Reviewer's report:

Dear Editor,

The manuscript describes a case of a patient with primary retroperitoneal serous adenocarcinoma. The patient initially had complete response to carboplatin/paclitaxel. After recurrence he was treated with radiotherapy and Nivolumab, which resulted in partial response and ongoing disease control. The case is presented very well. It also includes a mutational analysis of the tumor. It shows a new treatment option for patients with this rare type of cancer.

Major:

- There is no rationale, why immunotherapy was chosen. The PD-L1 status of both the tumor (TPS) and the tumor-infiltrating immune cells would be interesting to know.

- The tumor of the patient was estrogen receptor positive. Here the percentage / score would be interesting. Especially, why this was not targeted and why immunotherapy was chosen.

- It should be mentioned that the treatment with Nivolumab was off label.

Minor:

- The size of the tumor is not relevant for the abstract, it should be removed.

- The chemotherapy regimen carboplatin/paclitaxel should be added to the abstract.
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:
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