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**Reviewer’s report:**

The report by Liang and colleagues is a well written account of EGFR gene status in a series of patients from China. A few comments are offered for suggestions:

**Major Compulsory Revisions**

1) More information on how the patients for analysis were selected is needed. The paper says that only 133 of 886 were selected. The paper only says that patient with clinical data intact were selected. What does this mean? A median follow up, survival data, and such would be criteria that one would like to see mentioned.

2) If the authors insist on "intact clinical data", why are there no correlations with the clinical data? No response to therapy, survival, progression free survival?

3) The positive correlation between EGFR mutation and IHC is contrary to many other published reports. This makes one less confident in the conclusion that IHC may be an adequate marker for determining response to EGFR targeted therapies.

4) The statement that “no single test was sufficient to predict response to EGFR TKI" is not supported by the data in the paper. There was no attempt to correlate the results in this study with response to EGFR targeted therapies. There are amply published data that EGFR mutations are strongly associated with response to EGFR TKIs including the recently published IPASS trial data (N Engl J Med. 2009 Sep 3;361(10):947-57.).
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