Reviewer’s report

Title: A pitfall of bilateral inferior petrosal sinus sampling in cyclic Cushing’s syndrome

Version: 0 Date: 13 Jun 2019

Reviewer: Reviewer 2

Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

RELEVANCE - Does this case report make a contribution to medical knowledge, have educational value, or highlight the need for a change in clinical practice or diagnostic/prognostic approaches?
Yes, this report contributes to medical knowledge

CASE DESCRIPTION - Are the details of the case sufficiently well described to understand the patient's symptoms and course of treatment?
No - there are minor issues

DIAGNOSIS/INTERPRETATION - Based on the facts presented, are the diagnosis, interpretation, and course of treatment medically sound?
Yes, the work described is medically sound

DISCUSSION OF THE CASE - Does the discussion appropriately analyse the importance of the findings and their relevance to future understanding of disease processes, diagnosis or treatment? Has an adequate literature review pertinent to the case been included?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Could an appropriately REVISED version of this work represent a technically sound contribution?
Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: This case report describes a patient with cyclic ectopic cushing syndrome secondary to a neuroendocrine tumor. A BIPSS was done during an inactive phase of the disease leading to incorrect localization and surgery.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
This is a very tough and interesting case. It demonstrate that Cushing syndrome is always challenging. I have some question regarding the cases. It is not clear to me how retroduodenal NET was diagnosed? it was sampled during the whipple’s procedure? How you conclude that site was the primary? In the case report is not stated that the pancreatic met was a lymph node. This should be written more clearly. Additionally, how was the Ki67 of the initial biopsy (the met of the pancreas). It is very rare that a NET grade II transforms to a NET grade III. The bone biopsy showed a well differentiated tumor or a poor differentiated tumor.? How was the RECIST response to chemo???

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:
None
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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:

Acceptable

Declaration of competing interests
Please complete a declaration of competing interests, considering the following questions:

1. Have you in the past five years received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

2. Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this manuscript, either now or in the future?

3. Do you hold or are you currently applying for any patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

4. Have you received reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organization that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript?

5. Do you have any other financial competing interests?

6. Do you have any non-financial competing interests in relation to this paper?

If you can answer no to all of the above, write 'I declare that I have no competing interests' below. If your reply is yes to any, please give details below.
This reviewer has been recruited by a partner organization, Research Square. Reviewers with declared or apparent competing interests are not utilized for these reviews. This reviewer has agreed to publication of their comments online under a Creative Commons Attribution License attributed to Research Square and was paid a small honorarium for completing the review within a specified timeframe. Honoraria for reviews such as this are paid regardless of the reviewer recommendation.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal. I understand that my name will be included on my report to the authors and, if the manuscript is accepted for publication, my named report including any attachments I upload will be posted on the website along with the authors' responses. I agree for my report to be made available under an Open Access Creative Commons CC-BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). I understand that any comments which I do not wish to be included in my named report can be included as confidential comments to the editors, which will not be published.

I agree to the open peer review policy of the journal.