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The Authors report the case of a 79-year-old patient, sustaining a neck hematoma on post-operative day 2 after an uneventful carotid endarterectomy (CEA), requiring surgical drainage and hemostasis. The hematoma was associated with coagulation disorders with consequent disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC) attributed to a pre-operatively unknown prostate cancer with multiple bone metastases.

Late hematomas after CEA, appearing later than postoperative day 1, requiring surgical hemostasis, are uncommon, but undoubtedly exist. They are usually related to hematological disorders, early resumption of oral anticoagulants, poor blood pressure control and cancers at an advanced stage. Although bleeding due to disorders of coagulation in cancer patients is well known, the present case is of interest and its reporting could be worthwhile. Essentially 2 issues need to be addressed:

A. The Authors’ conclusion of cancer triggering DIC, which in turn caused hematoma is reasonable. However some more details should be provided, in particular: 1) the authors should stress that postoperative blood pressure was closely controlled, as a postoperative, undetected hypertensive status can trigger a progressive hematoma; 2) the authors should provide informations on postoperative anticoagulation administered to the patient (low molecular weight heparin and aspirin, aspirin alone, low molecular weight heparin and aspirin…)

B. A major, professional English language revision is mandatory.

Minor remarks:
# 1 Background, page 3, line 50: "surgical skills" would better read "technical flaws"
# 2 Background, page 1, line 1: "We discussed" would better read "We discuss"
# 3 Case presentation, page 4, line 15: "in Dec, 2017" would better read "on Dec, 2017"
# 4 Case presentation, page 4, line 20: "infarction lesions" would better read "infarctual lesions"
# 5 Case presentation, page 4, line 20: "and old infarction" would better read "and an old infarction"
# 6 Case presentation, page 4, line 26: "history including" would better read "history included"
# 7 Case presentation, page 4, line 28: "Aspirin has been administered" would better read "Aspirin had been administered"
# 8 Case presentation, page 4, line 36: "A standardized" would better read "A standard"
# 9 Case presentation, page 4, line 45: "On the second day" would better read "On post-operative day 2"
# 10 Case presentation, page 5, line 4: HGB 107 g/L would better read "10.7 mg/dl"
# 11 Case presentation, page 5, line 25: "neck hematoma removal" would better read "neck hematoma evacuation"
# 12 Case presentation, page 6, line 41: "during the first half year after the surgery" would better read "during a follow-up period of 6 months"
# 13 Discussion and conclusions, page 7, line 9: "hematoma evacuation was 6 hours" would better read "hematoma evacuation is 6 hours"
# 14 Discussion and conclusions, page 7, line 12: "surgical skills including" would better read "surgical technique including"
# 15 Discussion and conclusions, page 7, line 23: "Here we described" would better read "In this report we described"
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