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Reviewer's report:

There are still major points to be addressed before the manuscript is suitable for publication, the most important of which are pointed out below:

2.6. Methods, page 6. Information on neoadjuvant and adjuvant treatment is still poor/incomprehensive. Please use the term “neoadjuvant” instead of “adjuvant chemotherapy before surgery”. In your response, you state that “in order to get the same background of the treatment and reduce sample error, every patient should receive postoperative adjuvant chemotherapy”. I am not sure what you mean by this statement but if the proportion of patients, particularly with Stage II disease (or even Stage I?) that received chemotherapy was unusually high in this study, this must be notified in the Methods section and also acknowledged in the Discussions section. For instance, according to Table 2 and 3, there was no significant survival benefit from adjuvant chemotherapy, which could of in part be explained by the fact that it was given to the majority of patients. On the other hand, could it be speculated that CIAPIN1 is a treatment predictive factor?

6.1. and 6.2. The discussion still contains more that 50% referenceing to previous studies/results, and not even in relation to the results presented in this manuscript. As far as I can see, only previous results have been added to page 14 and 15. In fact, the results from this study are only presented in the last two paragraphs and not discussed at all.

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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