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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:

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

Y

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)
   - Main symptoms of the patient
   - Medical, family and psychosocial history
   - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

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.

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
   - Diagnostic methods
   - 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:

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

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/No

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

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: Yes, for a limited subset
9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

1. Language and grammar needs extensive editing and revision.
2. Rephrasing some aspects of case summary and discussion is suggested.
3. Background needs revision and rephrasing.
4. Page 3-

HIPEC has not been evaluated in setting of peritoneal metastasis from lung cancer.
It doesn't deserves a mention in the background of mentioned cases.

Page 9; lines 37-40
"therefore cytoreductive surgery and HIPEC treatment protocols could be indicated in highly selected cases"

HIPEC is being proposed in peritoneal mets from lung cancer.
The authors must provide reference of any case where HIPEC was used in peritoneal mets from lung cancer to substantiate their proposal; though it has been used malignant pleural effusion.

5. Page 4, lines 14-20

Taxol is perhaps a brand name- replace with generic name or give credit to the brand.
Taxol was replaced by gemcitabine will be better.

6. Page 5

"Chest x-ray showed a "ground glass" picture of left lung and bloodstream cultures were positive for candida albicans spp."

Was this patient immunocompromised ??
Did sputum or expectorate examination also showed Candida ??
7. Page 6; lines 33-43

Cytological examination of fluid is repeated.

8. Page 7

"these are the first literature report of diffuse peritoneal spread from lung cancer."

It doesn't appear diffuse as CC score was zero and it involved multiple sites in a segment.

Page 9; line 17

"indicated in isolated peritoneal metastases from lung cancer"

Here it is isolated mets.

9. The need for HPE picture of lung pathology and vis a vis peritoneal pathology would have added more substance.
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