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Reviewer’s report:

The paper reports a retrospective analysis about classic Kaposi’s Sarcoma in Morocco. In particular, Errihani and co-workers reviewed data about demographic, clinical and pathological staging, death or last follow-up for 56 patients with a diagnosis of classic Kaposi’s Sarcoma from 1998 to 2008.

Major Compulsory Revisions

1- Methods: the authors write that “HHV-8 antibodies were identified in only 5 patients in whom it was positive”. This statesman should be put in Results section, whereas in this section the method of antibody identification should be added, if it is possible.

2- Results, patients’ characteristics: Have the age at diagnosis and the duration to consultation after the first appearance of lesions a normal distribution? If so, the authors should use the mean and standard deviation and not the median and range (in table 2 too).

3- Results, clinical features and location of lesions: the first statesman is not clear: is the patient with ulceration one of 17 with plaque? And are the 18 subjects with multinodularity part of patients with nodular lesions? Moreover, in the last statements, the percentages of patients in stage I, II, III, and IV should coincide with the percentages in the abstract.

3- Discussion: In the group of subjects with classic Kaposi’s Sarcoma there is also a 15 years old girl. This is very strange, because the patient is very young for this disease. Are the authors sure that the diagnosis is right? However that my be, this point should be more deepened in the discussion.

4- The authors did not deepen their data about stages. In particular, if it is possible, they could add a table for patients’ characteristics, dividing the subjects in the four stages and verify if there are many significant differences, for example for age and gender. Moreover, in discussion the authors should comment their data and results about stages.

5- The discussion is too long and redundant: the authors should focalize on their results, deleting some parts not connected with their data.

Minor Essential Revisions
5- There are many typing errors, in particular about capital letters (i.e. “Visceral” in Abstract: Results, page 2, and “To asses the severity…” and “A prostatic Adenocarcinoma…” in page 4) and the correct form of “classic Kaposi’s Sarcoma” (i.e. page 8). The authors should check with more accuracy the whole paper.

6- Table 2: the number of female patients is missing.
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