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General

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

I have re-read this paper by Benoît et al presenting the cytogenetics of two cases of PPB in children. I remain of the opinion that these cases add to the literature and that the authors provide a thorough literature review. However, I am not satisfied that the paper has been sufficiently shortened as there is considerable repetition. I assume that this will be addressed by the editor.

My main concern remains with the karyotypes. My view was that the banded and FISH results should be combined into a single karyotype, but this has not been correctly presented. It is my opinion that the correct nomenclature would be:

Case 1:
38-44,X,-X,der(8)t(8;18)(p1?;q1?),dic(11;21)(p11;p11),-15,der(17)t(15;17)(q1?;p1?3),-18,del(20)(p12)

81-82<4n>,idemx2[cp2]/46,XX[7].ish....(following .ish abnormalities should be listed without .ish between each abnormality, just a comma and no spaces.

Case 2: (I feel that this should be written from a 4n not 2n basis…….)
80-109<4n>,XXYY,+X,der(1)t(1;8)x2,dup(3)(q?)x2,+4,der(?4)t(1;4),-5,dup(7)(q?),+8,-9,der(9)t(9;13).

If the karyotypes are presented correctly in the text they do not require to be repeated in the figure legends.

Table 2 provides a good review of the cytogenetics of previously reported cases. However, the ISCN is incorrect. There should be NO SPACES and idem should be used at every opportunity to simplify the results.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: No
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