Reviewer’s report

Title: Use Case Driven Evaluation of Open Databases for Pediatric Cancer Research

Version: 1 Date: 16 Oct 2018

Reviewer: Joseph Romano

Reviewer's report:

Thank you to the authors for your revisions. Although many of my more concrete recommendations (e.g., organizing the results by Use Case) have been addressed nicely, my concerns with the readability of the manuscript as a whole seem to have been largely neglected.

That being said, I think that the scientific content of the paper is much better developed. If the authors can make the paper easier to read and understand (as well as fix some other issues along the way), I think the paper would be in quite good shape overall. In other words, my concerns all should be addressable.

The following are my specific comments and concerns.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

- Pg 1, Loc 56: Can you briefly clarify *how* these characteristics differ in adult vs. pediatric cancers? You only state that they are different.

- Pg 2, Loc 14-15: Is this statement entirely true? I imagine there are some cancer types with very high prevalence in children, such as certain types of leukemia. Data availability, of course, is an entirely different issue...

- Pg 2, Loc 21: Missing citations?

- Pg 5, Loc 21-ish: The use cases are still somewhat vague. The way you define them needs to be clear. E.g., with "Which information can be found on a particular gene..." -- What do you mean by "information"? Something as simple as structured metadata, or something more complex like meaningful knowledge about the gene? Or just anything at all?

- Pg 5, Loc 36 (and onward): I think you need some specific context for the definitions you are declaring here. Essentially, some kind of preface saying that you are normalizing relevant terms/concepts in the online databases, in order to make sure that equivalent concepts align in your comparisons.
GENERAL COMMENTS:

- The body text still needs editing for wording and style. E.g., the first sentence in Background says "The term 'Pediatric Oncology' depicts the branch..."; the word 'depicts' does not work in this usage. Issues like these are quite prevalent throughout the text. A few larger sections are difficult to understand at all, such as the second full paragraph on Pg 2. I think a native speaker of English needs to proofread the manuscript.

- In the numbered list on pg 5, the list labels should be "UC1, UC2..." instead of "1, 2..." for consistency. Similarly, it helps if you use "UC1", etc in the main text, rather than "use case 1", or "the first use case" (e.g., Pg 11, Loc 12).

- Pg. 8, loc 15: Something is wrong with line breaks here

- Some other minor typesetting issues due to incorrect use of LaTeX need to be resolved. For example, opening quotes are typed in LaTeX source as ` (rather than ", which is for closing quotes only).

- As another very minor side comment, the highlighting color used on modified text (bright green) is rather challenging to read on a computer screen. You might want to stick to a different color in the future.
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