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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript describes some interesting findings concerning to the possible participation of 13-3-3# in laryngeal cancer and a series of experiments are organized to identify its role.

However, the m/s contains a lot of grammar errors and needs word by word correction. In addition, the authors have extensively used the technique of copy-and-paste without criticism, for example:

“Background, Page 4, Line 2”, they use the number 5,00,000 that was written in ref. 2 and

“Background, Page 4, Lines 3-5”, they incorporate the sentence written in ref. 3, however the occurrence rate is exactly opposite for men and women to that written (see the web pages of the British Cancer Society and the Finnish Cancer Society, or a Basic Otolaryngology edition).

To my opinion, these points are extremely unfair and a possible reason for rejection of the paper independently to the quality of work done.

There are in addition some points requiring clarification, revision or new experiments, as follows:

Page 7, Line 10: The composition of the “protein extracting fluid” and the volume to weight ratio must be given.

Page 12, second para: “The analyse result of 14-3-3epsilon gene expression levels with respect to the clinical characteristics (age, sex and the clinical stages) showed no differences in both protein and mRNA levels of 14-3-3epsilon regarding to patients’ age and sex, and in mRNA level to clinical stages (datas not shown)”. (A sentence with many grammar errors): The authors should include the results of RT-PCR in table IV (mRNA levels according to clinical stage).

Page 15, line 2 from bottom: “Our results implies that something wrong probably happens in G2 DNA damage checkpoint and there maybe molecular mechanism of 14-3-3epsilon on S phase arrest of laryngeal cancer cells.” It is not a clear sentence.

Page 16, second and third paragraphs: The results of the study indicated that 14-3-3epsilon affected cell apoptosis, and thus, as the authors mentioned, it might be responsible for the development of cancer. However, the protein levels were constant in PANL and stages I and II samples, and decreased in stages III and IV indicating that the protein has a distinct role in cancer invasion. So, the
authors must clearly discuss their observations.

Some of the grammar/syntax errors follow:

Page 5
Lines 7-8: Other six mammalian isoforms (#, #, #, #, # and #) have also been identified. The isoform “#” should be removed from the parentheses.
Line 17: “are” instead of “were”.

Page 6
Line 4 from bottom: “an internal” instead of “a internal”.

Page 7
Line 8: “were” instead of “was”.

Page 10
Line 5 from bottom: “were” instead of “was”.

Page 11
Line 3 from bottom: The sentence “The result showed significantly lower in LSCC tissues than those in PANL tissues” is grammatically uncorrect.

Page 12
Line 1: The sentence “The 14-3-3epsilon protein expressed level were significantly lower in LSCC tissues than those in PANL tissues” is grammatically uncorrect.
Line 6: what is the meaning of “analyse”?
Line 9: “data” instead of “datas”.

Page 13
Line 3: “a” instead of “an”

Page 14
Line 4 from bottom: “produces” instead of “produced”.
Line 3 from bottom: The sentence “The abnormal expression of 14-3-3epsilon are found in only a few kinds of cancers” is grammatically uncorrect.

Page 16
Line 6: what is the meaning of “analyse”?

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited

**Statistical review:** No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.