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The paper reports a rare case of CS due to EAS apparently cured by the administration of metyrapone.

Due to its rarity, the case is interesting although several aspects remain to be elucidated.

The main problem is the nature of the lung nodule whose biopsy, according to the authors did not reveal cancer cells: but which was the response of the pathologist? Which other cells/tissue was found?

In the response of the CRF stimulation test, ACTH levels are reported as basal and the lowest level. This is contradictory: being a stimulation test, the response is evaluated on the highest level.

Why, among the tumor markers, chromogranine A was not considered?

Pag. 8, line 16: dexamethasone is used for a suppression, not for a stimulation test.

Pag. 9, lines 7-10: wath does it mean the enlargement of the lung tumor? How was it detected? The association of the tumor enlargement with the increase in ACTH is not diagnostic, as reported, for an ACTH secreting tumor.

Pag 9, line 19-22: wath does content mean? Concentration? Level?

Pag. 9, line 26: Gallium scintigraphy: please specify the somatostatine analogue molecule.

Pag. 4 line 42 and pag. 7 line 45: Left lung
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.

Unable to assess

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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