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Reviewer’s report:

Sun et al. refer on the expression of ErbB3 binding protein 1 (Ebp1) in adenoid cystic carcinoma. They have analysed the immunohistochemical expression of Ebp in 66 cases (paired normal and tumor tissue) of adenoid cystic carcinoma. The expression of Ebp1 is stronger in tumor tissue than in normal salivary glands, and is inversely related with a clinicopathologic profile of aggressiveness. They claim therefore that Ebp1 acts as a tumor suppressor gene and that could be used as a marker of lesser aggressivity. To confirm this hypothesis, the authors have performed motility and proliferation assays in Ebp1-transfected cell lines (ACC-M) and have also correlated Ebp1 expression with MMP9, E-cadherin and ICAM-1 in the same cell lines. Sun et al. conclude that it may be used as prognostic indicator, and perhaps also as possible therapeutic target. The paper is interesting and should be published, if some weakness is addressed.

MAJOR POINT

Fig. 1D: It is very interesting to show the results of negative controls, but here only a tumor is shown. I would like to see also a negative control with normal tissue, (let say, the same block of figures B2 or C2).

MINOR POINTS:

1. Introduction, page 2, line 15: „...neoplasmas...“ should be „...neoplasias...“

2. Introduction, page 3, line 5: „...in consistent...“ should be „...consistent...“

3. Materials and methods, page 3: were the included patients consecutive? Or was there any kind of „exclusion criteria“?

4. Material and methods, page 4: was the pretreatment the same for all stainings? At which temperature? The different dilutions should be also precised.

5. Results section: In my opinion, it has no sense to give percentages with two significant digits; it is better to round the results to one significant digit

6. Results section, page 7, line 11, „...olid...“ should be „...solid...“

7. Discussion section, page 10, line 13: „...my interpret...“ should be „...may suggest...“
8. Discussion section, page 11, line 10: "...intergrin...“ should be "...integrin...

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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