

REVIEWER'S REPORT

Manuscript No.: IJAR-57444

Title: Primary Metastatic Pleural Ewing Sarcoma in a Young Adult A Case Report and Literature Review

Recommendation:

Accept as it is

✓ **Accept after minor revision.....**

Accept after major revision

Do not accept (*Reasons below*)

Rating	Excel.	Good	Fair	Poor
Originality		✓		
Techn. Quality		✓		
Clarity		✓		
Significance		✓		

Reviewer Name: Dr S. K. Nath

Detailed Reviewer's Report

Strength of the study

- Focuses on a rare and clinically significant condition with limited existing literature
- Detailed case presentation with clear clinical history and imaging findings on page 2
- Use of immunohistochemistry supports accurate diagnosis
- Good integration of case findings with previously reported studies
- Figures on page 4 clearly demonstrate tumor extent and treatment response
- Highlights important clinical challenges and disease progression patterns

Weakness of the study

- Single case report limits general applicability of findings
- Ethical clearance and patient consent not clearly mentioned
- Some sections are lengthy and could be more concise
- Molecular confirmation by FISH was not performed
- Minor grammatical and formatting issues in manuscript
- Limited follow up details and outcome assessment

Reviewers Comments

This manuscript presents a rare and clinically important case of primary pleural Ewing sarcoma in a young adult with metastatic disease at presentation. The case is well described, with detailed clinical findings and imaging support. The CT images on page 4 clearly show the tumor and its response to chemotherapy, which adds value to the report. The discussion is comprehensive and compares the case with previously reported literature, highlighting the aggressive nature of the disease and poor prognosis. However, ethical clearance and patient consent are not clearly stated and should be included. The writing is generally clear but needs minor grammatical corrections and better structuring in some sections. The absence of molecular confirmation and limited follow up are notable limitations. Overall, the manuscript is informative and contributes to existing knowledge, but requires minor improvement in clarity and reporting before publication.