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1. This article presents a case series of patients who undergo thermal ablation of recurrent metastatic tumors in the pelvis. Please discuss the differences between a cohort study and a case series.

2. Discuss the importance and pitfalls of publishing case series. What value do they add to the literature? What are the dangers of these types of publications?

3. How do you incorporate the information from case series into your practice? In what kinds of clinical scenarios do you find these reports valuable? Discuss a case that you have encountered in your practice where a published case report was helpful and how the case report informed your care of the patient.

4. How is this treatment novel? Does it offer something that prior treatments have not offered to women with recurrent pelvic cancer? What conclusions can be made about the efficacy and safety of the procedure in the pelvis?

5. These three patients had recurrent pelvic disease after three different primary tumors. Discuss the likely sites of recurrence of endometrial, cervical, and vulvar cancers and the timeline for their recurrence. What is the role of the generalist obstetrician–gynecologist in surveillance for recurrence?

6. Discuss the ethical issues of reporting novel findings on a limited number of patients. How is patient confidentiality ensured? Should patients be consented for publication of their findings?

7. The authors discuss that this type of treatment has been used outside of the pelvis for treatment of recurrent cancer. Discuss which types of cancer have been treated in this manner and the success of these treatments.

8. Radiofrequency ablation has been used to treat other disorders. Discuss the other indications for radiofrequency ablation and the success of this modality for other disorders.

9. Discuss the bias of reporting only positive case reports. Do you think that negative results would be valuable in the literature?