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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript is a retrospective review of patients that underwent a secondary cytoreduction for endometrial cancer during a 17 year time period. The manuscript is well-written and easy to follow.

Major revisions

1. I think the authors would benefit from having a comparison set of patients that did not undergo cytoreduction to make the conclusion that surgery benefits these patients. If they have access to a database over a 17 year period, this should be possible. If nothing else this should be listed a a major weakness of the paper.

2. The authors should describe how the patients were chosen for surgery? Some had treatment for recurrence before surgery, others did not. Was there a rationale for offering these patients surgery? It is not clear in the paper.

3. The authors conclude that patients with small and isolate residua disease should be offered surgery. Are they not candidates for radiation? Did they have previous radiation? This should be addressed in the manuscript.

4. Higher grade was associated with better outcome after surgery? Why did the authors think this is the case? More responsive to chemotherapy? If so, do they really benefit over chemotherapy alone?

Overall, I am not sure you can draw conclusions from the current data without a comparison group. Or at least adding what the preoperative selection criteria were.

Minor revisions

1. There is a missing word in the first line of abstract.. "has been to prove"?

2. The authors keep saying "multiple recurrences" but I think they mean multiple sites at the time of recurrence...this should be clarified.

3. Sarcomas were "excluded" instead of "not reviewed"

4. How were the asymptomatic patients diagnosed on routine follow up? Imaging? Physical exam? Were they cuff recurrences?

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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