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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting case of a recurrent medullary carcinoma with negative calcitonin and CEA both at baseline and recurrence. The authors include a comprehensive literature review, summarised in Table 1. Although this is a case worthy of publication and the authors have addressed the concerns raised by reviewers previously, the manuscript still requires extensive editing as the language is often confusing. I have included some examples below:

Page 4 line 22: what does 'MTC at definitive' mean?

Page 5 line 7: what is a retrosternal develop? I take it this must mean retrosternal extension

Page 9 line 4: 'mandatory and diriment' - this does not make sense to me, please rephrase

I also note that, although most 'CT' abbreviations have been switched to 'calcitonin' as per reviewer suggestion, this has not been consistently applied throughout the manuscript, and the remaining random 'CT' terms are very confusing to the reader. This is also the case in Table 1.

Finally, although Table 1 is a nice review of previous literature, it is not clear whether the last 5 columns refer to the baseline tumour or to recurrences. I suspect the former is true, but then it would make sense to have these columns before the 'recurrence' column.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

Not relevant to this manuscript

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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