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Reviewer's report:

The authors have not adequately responded to my comments or those from the other reviewers, I regret to have to observe. There is much overlap between the comments; I give only one example. Me and prof. Campbell seriously question the normal reference. I cite Campbell "It is the view of this author that the analysis should be repeated using matching normal DNA". Simply stating that matched normal was not available, is then not enough to counter 2 of 3 reviewers. As an alternative I would like to give the option to perform both biological validation (an independent series) and technical validation (other technique to detect LOH and CNA's). This could be implemented in the article as described by Michiels (Michiels et al., 2005)

The data are not available in GEO. The authors state that this is being worked on. This is not sufficient, I have experienced before that data never got uploaded where I (and the scientific community) ask for GEO uploads and correct annotation. This is one week work and should be performed before initial submission and the token given to the reviewers (Brazma et al., 2001; Ioannidis et al., 2009).

Without further comment do I find it disrespectful and misplaced of the authors to asses the work we have published ourselves previously.
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