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**Reviewer’s report:**

The research question is clear. It is assessing the value of pMEK5 in assessing the prognosis of a CRC patient. The study seems well thought out. The analytical methods used are appropriate. The tables are well laid out. All in all the study is well done.

The limitations of the work are not very clearly stated. This is a retrospective look at the expression of a biomarker and the study has all of the inevitable problems of the retrospective study of not being able to establish if the expression of the marker is after the progression has occurred. The value of the biomarker as an indicator of progression may thus be limited.

The abstract does not discuss the survival analysis at all. The authors thus do not describe the non-significance of pMEK5 in the multivariate Cox’s PHREG. The title also seems a little misleading given the non-significance in multivariate regression. The point the authors make in the discussion about the usefulness of pmek5 as a marker of TNM stage is a good one and perhaps would be more appropriate to add in the title.

There are a couple of typographical errors but in general the writing is of an acceptable standard.

Please correct the MS for the errors, add a discussion of the survival analysis results in the abstract and this reviewer would suggest modifying title as discussed above.
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