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Thank you for consideration of our manuscript for publication in your journal. We have reviewed the above manuscript according to your reviewer’s comments.

**Reviewer # 1 (Dr Makris)**

**MINOR COMMENTS:**

1. *I therefore suggest to the authors to be more specific in their discussion and to suggest the form of a future study that could prove their hypothesis of a genetic predisposition that may underly the presence of second cancer in spinal corependymomas.*

   Thank you for the wonderful idea. We look for a way how will be able to observe specific genes in these patients in order to discover a probably genetic predisposition.

2. *In addition i suggest to the authors to use their table in the main article and not as a supplement.*

   Done

**Reviewer # 2 (Dr Belhassen)**

**MINOR COMMENTS:**

1. *First, the authors should demonstrate what is really new in this article.*

   The new in this article, is the idea that in those patients who underwent surgery for spinal cord ependymoma (a benign tumor), there is a for existing a de novo neoplasia, because of a predisposition or a general failure on the repairing mechanism at the DNA. So these patients must be checked of genetic aspect, in order to avoid or to detect early, a secondary neoplasia.

2. *Second the authors should give a link to the daily clinical practice and integrate the following citations (Mol Med. 2011 Mar-Apr;17(3-4):308-16; J Neurooncol.2005 Nov;75(2):157-61).*

   Some references were added.