Reviewer’s report

Title: Carbonic anhydrase IX in oligodendroglial brain tumors

Version: 2 Date: 22 September 2007

Reviewer: Matthias Preusser

Reviewer’s report:

General

The authors have incorporated most requested changes in a satisfactory manner. However, some points remain problematic or unclear:

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

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

1. Figure 1 is still of considerable concern. Figure 1A may not show tumour tissue at all. The low cell density suggests that this image may show non-neoplastic, maybe gliotic, CNS tissue or CNS tissue with low content of tumour cells. Figure 1B is of too low magnification to assess whether the brown signal is likely to be a specific immunostaining signal. Figure 1C: Also here, the low cell density raises doubt that the image shows unequivocal tumour tissue at all. Further, the immunostaining signal looks rather diffuse and might only be unspecific staining. Figure 1D: due to the very weak counterstain (nuclear stain), it remains unclear whether the tissue is viable or necrotic. Therefore, there is doubt regarding the specificity of the stain.

2. The following requested change has not been incorporated by the authors: The authors should more precisely define the categories used for evaluation of immunostainings (e.g. strong immunostaining = 50% of tumour tissue immunostained, etc.). Please do so.

3. The authors describe in the response to reviewers that immunostainings were evaluated by three observers during one session on a multiheaded microscope, but this information is not given in the paper. Please include the sentence “immunostainings were evaluated by three observers during one session on a multiheaded microscope” in the manuscript.

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

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)
4. Regarding observer variability at assessment of MIB-1 proliferation index the authors merely state that they are confident that their results are reliable and well-repeatable, instead of providing data supporting their opinion.

**What next?:** Accept after minor essential revisions

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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