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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Findings that shed new light on the possible pathogenesis of a disease or an adverse effect

Has the case been reported coherently?: Yes

Is the case report authentic?: Yes

Is the case report ethical?: Yes

Is there any missing information that you think must be added before publication?: Yes

Is this case worth reporting?: No

Is the case report persuasive?: No

Does the case report have explanatory value?: Yes

Does the case report have diagnostic value?: Yes

Will the case report make a difference to clinical practice?: Yes

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

Kosuge and the colleagues described about rare case of long-term follow up of pituicytoma. Several points have to be clarified.

Major points

The authors should describe the visual status after the first operation. Why the patient was left simply follow-up without radiation therapy or immediate second surgery through transcranial approach? The authors should describe the therapeutic strategy.

How was the visual status after the second surgery? Was it improved?
Minor points

In introduction section the description ‘basically a low-grade astrocytoma’ is confusing and could lead to misunderstanding. It should be changed to ‘corresponds to a low-grade astrocytoma’.

The figures of the surgical specimen would be better to be shown. There are still possibility of collision tumors with different pathologies.
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