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Reviewer’s report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?

Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

Comments:

None

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?

Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

a. The relevant patient information, including:

- De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity) YES APPROPRIATELY DE-IDENTIFIED

- Main symptoms of the patient YES PRESENTED ADEQUATELY

- Medical, family and psychosocial history- NNEDS TO BE MORE IN DETAIL ESP SMOKING PACK YEARS

- Relevant past interventions and their outcomes- WAS THERE A PREVIOUS ECHO TO INFORM PREVIOUS PULMONARY PRESSURES
b. The relevant physical examination findings

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at T = 0, follow up at T = 1 month.

a timeline would have helped

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:

DIAGNOSTIC METHODS DETAILS OF THE CT NOT DESCRIBED

WHEN AND WHY WAS BM BIOPSY PERFORMED?

HOW MUCH BLOODS TRANSFUSED

ISN'T THE CTPA MORE SENSITIVE THAN SCINTIGRAPHY?

WAS THE PATIENT ON LMWHEPARIN HAS THIS HELPED BECAUSE HEPARIN HAS ANTI-ANGIOGENESIS FEATURES?

- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)

- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable

e. Types and mechanism of intervention

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits

Comments: a sketchy account of a short illness the patient had

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: No PLEASE SEE COMMENTS BELOW

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments: YES

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: THE SURVIVAL OF WEEKS IS NOT SUBSTANTIATED WITH A REFERENCE LINE

THE ARGUMENT THAT STEROIDS IMPROVED PROGNOSIS IS SPECULATION AND SURVIVAL IMPROVED IS NOT SUBSTANTIATED. THE FACT THAT THIS INTERVENTION WAS ONLY 2 WEEKS PRIOR TO THE DEMISE OF THE PATIENT

THERE IS NO INFORMATION AS WHETHER THERE WAS PE ON POST MORTEM EXAMINATION

THERE IS NO INFORMATION ON THE ECHO EVIDENCE OF PULM HTN PREVIOUSLY

PLEASE QUANTIFY SMOKING DENSITY (THIS MAY EXPLAIN PULM HTN WORSENED BY THE TUMOR) THIS IS VITAL INFORMATION.

THE NUMBER OF REFERENCES IS VERY SMALL AND NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND REWRITTEN

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

THE FACT THAT THIS IS FIVE YEARS AFTER FULL CURATIVE INTENT AND THE PRESENTATION IS SO LATE MAY BE THE UNIQUE ASPECT OF THIS CASE REPORT AND THE SPECULATION THAT 2 WEEKS OF STEROIDS WAS THE REASON FOR IMPROVED SURVIVAL IS NOT SUBSTANTIATED

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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