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Reviewer's report:

Major Compulsory Revisions

1) Background start with definition of GCT simply as a benign tumor (!!!): I think GCT cannot be defined as "benign" but a bone tumor of "uncertain behaviour" histologically benign but sometimes aggressive, considering the importance of Campanacci's grading.

2) the risk of GCT lung metastases (about 2%) is never mentioned, it should be remarked in Conclusions

2) epidemiology of bone clavicular tumors should be described: apropos of this point, the article entitled "Primary malignant clavicular tumours: a clinicopathological analysis of six cases and evaluation of surgical management." published on Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2011 Jul;131(7):935-9 was not cited in the manuscript and included in the text.

It shoul be very useful to argue about the epidemiology and differential diagnosis and surgical management of bone clavicular tumors.

3) in Case presentation the patient underwent PET as the first examination after clinical symptoms: why??? Xrays should be the first step, otherwise it should be explained by the authors. Moreover, initial PET is a systemic investigation including also CT, but then the patient underwent another CT, 2 types (99Tc and Gallium) of scintigraphy and even angiography... I find it very disproportionate before a ultrasonography- or CT- guided tru cut biopsy!!! Even if clavicle is a rare location of tumors the patient had not systemic symptoms or comorbidity to justify all these examinations!!! See, the authors described the lesion as if it was hypervascularised... but it is strange for a II grade GCT that does not involve soft tissues!!!! I think readers could get confused by this diagnostic pathway, it should be revised.

Minor revisions

1) the third sentence of Background lacks of verb ("is often difficult")

2) "including radionuclide scanning" should be removed from the last sentence but one of Background

I favorably revised the assigned manuscript, but I regret the article I wrote, entitled "Primary malignant clavicular tumours: a clinicopathological analysis of
six cases and evaluation of surgical management.” published on Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2011, was not cited in the manuscript.

I suggested to the authors to consider it for revision of their work.
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