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Reviewer’s report:

The debate article addresses the role of computational cancer biology and comes to the conclusion that additional education in the field will be the key to more progress in the future.

1. Does the debate present a novel argument, or a novel insight into existing work?

Computational Cancer Biology is a novel and growing field that as the authors state has not gotten enough attention. This debate might increase the visibility and acceptance of the field - there are not many discussions of the kind.

2. Does the debate address an important problem of interest to a broad biomedical audience?

The discussion will be of interest to most of the audience of the journal.

3. Is the piece well argued and referenced?

The piece is well argued.

However:

-- the authors already assume that the reader already accepts and knows about the importance of the field. Additional arguments might help to convince the critical reader. What are the achievements of computational cancer biology this far? Name some success stories? What is the potential advancement that can be gained by putting more emphasis on the field?

One could cite articles like:

Gene expression patterns of breast carcinomas distinguish tumor subclasses with clinical implications.

- A colorectal cancer classification system that associates cellular phenotype and responses to therapy.
Sadanandam A1, Lyssiotis CA, Homicsko K, Collisson EA, Gibb WJ,

-- The authors come to the conclusion that a better education is the key? Are there other models possible? How is the current interaction between Computer Scientist or Statistician with the biologist? How can this be improved? Is it feasible the one person can have enough insights in both fields or does it need better interaction?

4. Has the author used logical arguments and sound reasoning?
Yes.

5. Is the piece written well enough for publication?
Yes.

Minor Essential Revisions:
More citations are needed to demonstrate or prove the points.

**Level of interest:** An exceptional article

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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