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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 didn't have any ethical concerns, and approval from local Institutional Review Board and from the patient were obtained in written form.

3. Does the Introduction explain the relevance of the case to the medical literature?
   Yes to some degree; as the author concentrate on FGF 23 not on its relation to osteomalacia.

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): mentioned well except the ethnicity.
      - Main symptoms of the patient: written well and dated.
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history: I considered that it is written well but the author should mention date in year and months; not in year only.
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes: yes; they mentioned well.

   b. The relevant physical examination findings: yes, the physical examination is mentioned but deficient in local exam of the large 2 NFomas; they have to describe the mass in full details; as regards to the consistency, tenderness, mobility over the surrounding tissues, , and the covering skin.

   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. : dates are mentioned in two situations, but should be mentioned in mo/yr.

   d. Diagnostic assessments, including:
      - Diagnostic methods : fully covered.
      - Challenges (e.g., financial, language/cultural): Non applicable.
      - Reasoning and prognostic characteristics (e.g., staging), where applicable: Non applicable.
e. Types and mechanism of intervention: fully covered.

f. A summary of the clinical course of all follow-up visits: No summary done.

Comments: the case is fully investigated with different lab, radiologic and histologic tests, and therapeutic trials of the hypophosphatemia and osteomalacia.

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented?
Comments: No; because the osteomalacia is explained only by the high serum level of FGF23, but in fact, a lot of causes can be accused; 2nd thing, is that there is mild increase of level of the FGF23 in this study and also the FGF23 is not detected in the resected NFomas.

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, the patient anonymity is well protected.

7. Is the Abstract representative of the case presented?
Comments: Yes, is representative of the case.

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

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
The 2 NFomas, one in the left upper arm and the second on the right forearm are mentioned different times in 4 places in the manuscript; it is enough to be mentioned in one time and referred to them in the remaining of the manuscript. 2nd thing, they are not on the surface; they are in the limb, last thing, you didn't give explanation for the multiple rib fractures; is the osteomalacia is the only one responsible?

Level of interest
Please indicate how interesting you found the manuscript:

An article of importance in its field

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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