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Reviewer's report:

I carefully read the manuscript entitled "New Cancer Therapeutics for Neurofibromatosis 2 (NF2)" and in my opinion, the topic is of interest to the journal. However there are some more or less important details that make it unclear in several points; my decision is to propose minor revisions. Below there are the comments.

1. In all manuscript, there are several mistakes. I recommend the authors to revise it all.

Methods section

2. In the "Cell culture" paragraph, the authors did not specified the origin of KT21 and Ben-Men-1.

3. In the "Cell viability assay" paragraph, the authors did not specified if PF3758309 and Frax1036 are positive control and if they are synthesized by the authors or they are a trade products.

4. In the "Western blots" paragraph, the authors forgot to mention the reference. About this paragraph, the authors did not specified what the results by WB analyses are.

Results section

5. The legend of figure 3 is not clear. I recommend the authors to revise it.

6. In Figure 3 IOMM-Lee cells and BJ bar graphs are without error bars. This is because they were made in single analysis?

7. In figure 5 there is a mistake in the second graph of section B. STX3451 and STX2895 are at 600nM concentration and not at 300nM as indicate.

8. The legend of figure 6 is not clear. I ask to the authors to indicate the measure units of the distance. Then they indicated the observation period between 96 and 118 hours but for IOMM-Lee cells and HEI-193 they indicate 93 and 94 hours, respectively.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

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.

I am able to assess the statistics

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