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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 am rather surprised that "Ethics Review Approval was NOT applicable".

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): Were mentioned
      - Main symptoms of the patient: Were mentioned and discussed
      - Medical, family and psychosocial history: Were discussed
      - Relevant past interventions and their outcomes: Were mentioned though details were unavailable or unknown to be discussed

   b. The relevant physical examination findings: Were mentioned

   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. : Were mentioned and noted diagrammatically.

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

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

Comments: All the above mentioned from Que 4. (a-f) Were discussed

5. Is the interpretation (discussion and conclusion) well balanced and supported by the case presented? Yes, it is as it demonstrates one patient in whom both types of cancer were documented supported by pathological evidence and additional diagnostic tests though unavailable were mentioned and discussed.
Comments:

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: It is

8. Does the case represent a useful contribution to the medical literature?
Comments: Yes, it does as it is still considered a rarity based on number of publications with multiple presentations.

9. Additional comments for the author(s)?
Thank you with appreciation for the rectifications made which have informed us of the type of body fluid measured was serum and not plasma with prediagnostic, diagnostic and post-diagnostic levels provided so reader can see trending pattern of patients chronic diseases. This has further enhanced scientific basis of the manuscript.
In addition, Can you please clarify why there was NO Ethics Review Application submitted just for my information. Thank you so very much for providing me the opportunity to review this informative and interesting manuscript.
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