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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
1 Title. The title and the manuscript I not consistent. The authors mainly emphasized CEUS findings, the title should reflect that.  
2 Abstract: Conclusion is too pretentious. It is not possible to conclude that CEUS is an effective tool for angiosarcoma diagnosis. The report only presents the finding of a single case.  
3 Key words. Too long and pertinent.  
4 Background. Rectal cancer and syphilis detail is not necessary here.  
5 Methods. N/A  
6 Case summary: syphilis is active or under treatment or completely cured? Please explain clearly. The combination of syphilis, angiosarcoma, and rectal cancer is very interesting. The authors should emphasize this, and try to explain possible mechanisms, immune suppression maybe. Why did the authors performed a single phase CT examination, even though they knew that the case was possibly malignant? MRI images would be fine to present.  
7 Discussion. Includes too pretentious statements, like an original study. This section should be written again, main imaging findings on CT, MRI, and ultrasound should be briefly defined. Studies about CEUS should be summarized, and similar findings of the authors should emphasized.  
8 Illustrations and tables. Please read above.  
9 Biostatistics. N/A  
10 Units. Appropriate  
11 References. Too many references for a case report, should be summarized.  
12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Average-below average  
13 Research methods and reporting. Appropriate  
14 Ethics statements. Appropriate
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This case reported the imaging and pathological examinations of a female patient with PHA, especially the performance on contrast-enhanced ultrasonography, which provides a certain reference value for clinical diagnosis of the disease. However, I have a few questions. 1) The background section mentioned that PHA accounts for approximately 2% of primary liver tumors, please provide literature support. 2) In the discussion section, CEUS has a high diagnostic value for PHA, whether it is possible to add some content to elaborate its diagnostic value. 3) Please check whether the full name of the abbreviation in the article is all written.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. The authors described a rare case with Primary hepatic angiosarcoma (PHA) and rectal cancer. You also presented the Contrast-enhanced ultrasonography (CEUS) and characteristic changes in laboratory values for PHA, which is important for the clinicians in the practice.  

2. Of course, in your manuscript, you should report the treatment of the rectal cancer and whether it is one of the cause of the death for the case.  

3. The paper is well written and the language quality is excellent.
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