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Reviewer's report:

1. Do you believe the case report is authentic?
   
   Yes

2. Do you have any ethical concerns? Please consider if local Institutional Review Board approval or ethical approval was obtained (if appropriate) and if the patient (or their parent or guardian in the case of children under 18) gave written, informed consent to publish this case and any accompanying images. A statement to this effect should appear in the manuscript.

   Comments: I have no ethical concerns

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   
   Yes

4. Does the article report the following information? Where information is missing, please specify.

   a. The relevant patient information, including:
      
      - De-identified demographic information (age, gender, ethnicity)
      - Main symptoms of the patient
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes

   Yes
b. The relevant physical examination findings
Yes

c. Important dates and times in this case (if appropriate, organized as a timeline via a figure or table); if specific dates could lead to patient identification, consider including time relevant to initial presentation, i.e. initial presentation at $T = 0$, follow up at $T = 1$ month.
Yes

d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
- Diagnostic methods
- Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural)
- Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable
Yes

e. Types and mechanism of intervention
Yes

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits
Yes

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?

Comments: see below

6. Is the anonymity of the patient protected? Please consider any identifying information in images such as facial features or nametags, whether the patient is named etc. If not, please detail below.

Yes
7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?

Comments: Yes

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?

Comments: Yes

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?

I was pleased to be asked to revise the manuscript entitled 'Recurrent spontaneous pneumothoraces and vaping in an 18-year-old male: a case report and review of the literature' by Bonilla et al.

In this paper, the Authors report the case of a young male patient who was admitted within 15 days to their Emergency Department for recurrent right spontaneous pneumothorax. The patient presented a common body phenotype (tall and thin) and his medical history was positive for marijuana and electronic cigarette use. Both pneumothorax episodes were treated by means of chest drain placement.

The case is well presented and the images included in the manuscript are self-explanatory and good quality. The manuscript as a whole may certainly provide additional knowledge of the potential risk of e-cigarette use for the health.

In the discussion section, the Authors go into a depth analysis of the potential pathophysiologic mechanisms underlying the onset of pneumothorax in vapers. Although interesting, this part of the discussion is a little bit dispersive, and the Authors should revise it focusing on the target. Moreover, the potential effect of marijuana use as a cause of pneumothorax in the present patient should be underlined.

Finally, I want to ask to the Authors why a surgical treatment to prevent recurrences has not been proposed to the patient during his second hospital stay.
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