Malignant perivascular epithelioid cell tumour (PEComa) of the lung – a rare entity
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Reviewers’ Comments to Original Submission

Reviewer 1: anonymous
Nov 28, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Revise with Major Modifications
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: 50

Custom Review Questions Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you? 3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper’s content? 5 - High/Yes
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper’s content? 5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly? 2
Are the results/conclusions justified? 3
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? 3
How adequate is the data presentation? 4
Are units and terminology used correctly? 4
Is the number of cases adequate? 5 - High/Yes
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate? 3
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? 4
Does the reader get new insights from the article? 3
Please rate the practical significance. 2
Please rate the accuracy of methods. 3
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. 4
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. 5 - High/Yes
Please rate the appropriateness of the references. 1 - Low/No
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. 4
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. 2
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript? Yes
Comments to Authors:

The authors present one case of malignant PEComa that relapsed impressively within a very short interval following lobectomy. From the surgical point of view, the manuscript is informative insofar as the existence of this rare entity is communicated.

The short description of PEComas in the introduction, however, causes confusion rather than clarity, and should be written in a clear-cut way. Especially lymphangioleiomyomatosis and tuberous sclerosis which are mentioned separately (once in the introduction and once in the discussion, respectively) should be put into clear context.

The biological properties of this very tumour are the central message of this article. The PEComa in this patient seems to have displayed a rather unusual immunohistochemical profile that has not been described before. Nevertheless, there are more and more recent publications on that topic than mentioned by the authors.

Reviewer 2: anonymous

Nov 05, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Revise with Major Modifications
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: 60

Custom Review Questions Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you? 4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper’s content? 3
Does the introduction present the problem clearly? 3
Are the results/conclusions justified? 3
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? 4
How adequate is the data presentation? 3
Are units and terminology used correctly? 1 - Low/No
Is the number of cases adequate? N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate? N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? 4
Does the reader get new insights from the article? 4
Please rate the practical significance. 4
Please rate the accuracy of methods. N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. 1 - Low/No
Please rate the appropriateness of the references. 1 - Low/No
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. 1 - Low/No
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. 3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript? Yes

Comments to Authors:

Here is an interesting case report that is valuable because of the rare incidence of „Malignant Perivascular Epitheloid Cell Tumor of the Lung“. Authors should be commended for writing a manuscript in a language different than their mother tongue. There are significant grammatical (present, past tense in the text ect.) and spelling errors.

The figures are well done and easily understandable except figure E. Figure E should be just one axial CT slice of good quality showing the recurrent tumor. In addition please define all abbreviations when first used. All authors named in the text and table have to be cited properly according to the style of the journal in the references.

Overall, this is a highly interesting report of a very rare case with PEComa of the lung. Further intensive rework to meet the standards for publication of this journal had to be done.
Authors’ Response to Reviewer Comments

Dec 07, 2016

1] The short description of PEComas in the introduction, however, causes confusion rather than clarity, and should be written in a clear-cut way. Especially lymphangioleiomyomatosis and tuberous sclerosis which are mentioned separately (once in the introduction and once in the discussion, respectively) should be put into clear context.

2] The biological properties of this very tumour are the central message of this article. The PEComa in this patient seems to have displayed a rather unusual immunohistochemical profile that has not been described before. Nevertheless, there are more and more recent publications on that topic than mentioned by the authors.

3] Authors should be commended for writing a manuscript in a language different than their mother tongue. There are significant grammatical (present, past tense in the text ect.) and spelling errors.

4] The figures are well done and easily understandable except figure E. Figure E should be just one axial CT slice of good quality showing the recurrent tumor. In addition please define all abbreviations when first used. All authors named in the text and table have to be cited properly according to the style of the journal in the references.

Reviewer’s Comments to 1st Revision

Reviewer 1: anonymous

Dec 16, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Accept with Minor Revision
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: 80

Custom Review Questions
Is the subject area appropriate for you? 3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper’s content? 3
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper’s content? 3
Does the introduction present the problem clearly? 4
Are the results/conclusions justified? 4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? 4
How adequate is the data presentation? 4
Are units and terminology used correctly? 4
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate? 5 - High/Yes
Is the number of cases adequate? 4
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? 5 - High/Yes
Does the reader get new insights from the article? 3
Please rate the practical significance. 3
Please rate the accuracy of methods. 3
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. 5 - High/Yes
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. 4
Please rate the appropriateness of the references. 5 - High/Yes
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. 1 - Low/No
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. 3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript? Yes

Comments to Authors:
The authors have made efforts to improve the manuscript, inserting passages about the different presentations of PEComa. There is just the problem that these statements seem to be hardly connected to the rest of the manuscript. Some editing, some connecting, explaining words would be required.

The help of a native speaker is recommended.
Reviewer 2: anonymous
Dec 12, 2016

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: N/A

Custom Review Questions Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you? 4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly? 4
Are the results/conclusions justified? 4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? 4
How adequate is the data presentation? N/A
Are units and terminology used correctly? 3
Are the number of cases adequate? N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate? N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? 4
Does the reader get new insights from the article? 4
Please rate the practical significance. 3
Please rate the accuracy of methods. N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. 2
Please rate the appropriateness of the references. 4
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. 2
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. 3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript? No: accepted for publication

Comments to Authors:
I believe the report of this rare case is worthwhile to read.

Authors’ Response to Reviewer Comments
Dec 22, 2016

We have taken the help of a native speaker to make the language more comprehensive and connected and as per the suggestions of reviewers.

Reviewers’ Comments to 2nd Revision

Reviewer 1: anonymous
Jan 06, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: 80

Custom Review Questions Response
Is the subject area appropriate for you? 3
Does the title clearly reflect the paper’s content? 5 - High/Yes
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper’s content? 5 - High/Yes
Does the introduction present the problem clearly? 5 - High/Yes
Are the results/conclusions justified? 4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? 5 - High/Yes
How adequate is the data presentation? 5 - High/Yes
Are units and terminology used correctly? 5 - High/Yes
Is the number of cases adequate? 5 - High/Yes
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate? 3
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? 4
Does the reader get new insights from the article? 5 - High/Yes
Please rate the practical significance. 4
Please rate the accuracy of methods. 4
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. 3
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. 5 - High/Yes
Please rate the appropriateness of the references. 5 - High/Yes
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. 1 - Low/No
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. 3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript? No: Reviewed the manuscript twice already. Hardly any improvement in writing style.

Comments to Authors:
The description and the patho-histological background have been improved according to the suggestions.

Reviewer 2: anonymous
Jan 07, 2017

Reviewer Recommendation Term: Accept
Overall Reviewer Manuscript Rating: N/A

Custom Review Questions
Is the subject area appropriate for you? 4
Does the title clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Does the abstract clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Do the keywords clearly reflect the paper’s content? 4
Does the introduction present the problem clearly? 4
Are the results/conclusions justified? 4
How comprehensive and up-to-date is the subject matter presented? 3
How adequate is the data presentation? 3
Are units and terminology used correctly? N/A
Is the number of cases adequate? N/A
Are the experimental methods/clinical studies adequate? N/A
Is the length appropriate in relation to the content? 3
Does the reader get new insights from the article? 4
Please rate the practical significance. 3
Please rate the accuracy of methods. N/A
Please rate the statistical evaluation and quality control. N/A
Please rate the appropriateness of the figures and tables. 3
Please rate the appropriateness of the references. 3
Please evaluate the writing style and use of language. 2
Please judge the overall scientific quality of the manuscript. 3
Are you willing to review the revision of this manuscript? No: Article accepted

Comments to Authors:
This case report is after all worth to be published. After major corrections there is a much better reading after major corrections.