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Reviewer's report:

I believe that the revised manuscript is considerably improved compared to the original version. Still, I have a few comments:

Minor revisions:

1. I do not agree that the Kaplan-Meier method and log-rank test is not suitable for a follow-up period of 3 years. If the authors have access to these follow-up data, such analyses should be performed (and since all patients were followed at the same hospital these data should be accessible). If not, the reasons for this should be stated.

2. In the new section in page 5, it is stated that “specimens were not individually identifiable”. In that case, it should be impossible to connect the levels of S100 proteins with the clinical data of each patient. How do the authors explain this?

3. As commented in my previous report, the manuscript needs language correction before being published. Certain misspellings have been corrected, but there are still several errors that must be corrected. Some examples of errors: “chooses” and “focussed” (page 2), “most frequent form of cancer in woman” and “S100 are small..” instead of “S100 proteins are small…” (page 3), “proteins were digest” and “one of the monoclonal antibody” (page 7), “of the all S100 proteins” and “phatological” (page 11).

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

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