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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?: No

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?: No

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

Is the anonymity of the patient protected?: Yes

Comments to authors:

The authors conducted an interesting review study to investigate the development of the second cancer in patients treated for spinal cord ependymomas. I find the topic clinically relevant. The report is well written, short and suggest a novel hypothesis; it has an explanatory value and could be helpful in the clinical practice.

The strength of their report is that they can form an interesting hypothesis that merits consideration and this could be the basis for a future study.

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 underlie the presence of second cancer in spinal cord
ependymomas. In addition I suggest to the authors to use their table in the main article and not as a supplement.
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