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Which of the following best describes what type of case report this is?: Unexpected or unusual presentations of a disease

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?: Yes

Is the case report persuasive?: Yes

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?: No

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

1. In case presentation part of the report, the writer has mentioned that they did a tumour biopsy via neuroendoscopy, I would like them to give reasons why did not they resect the tumour. This would have helped them to get larger specimen for histopathology as well. In the discussion part they have mentioned that they could obtain only small fragments of tumour.

2. It would be worthwhile to discuss the differential diagnosis of the pineal gland tumors and pineal gland metastasis in more detail.

3. The reference for the statement “Hanada et al. reviewed 33 cases of metastatic pineal tumors diagnosed in life…….” in the discussion part of the report is wrongly stated.

4. The authors have not gone into details of hormonal effects of pineal
metastasis and their management.

5. Authors need to recheck the references (ref no 13)
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