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**Reviewer's report:**

The inclusion of 83 additional new serous ovarian cancer samples, as indirectly suggested by the two other reviewers, markedly improved the quality, reproducibility, and statistical significance of the manuscript. Unfortunately, this added a new issue about the manuscript because the previous and preliminary study was apparently not reproducible. I respect the honesty of the authors to include and mention these new data.

Among the data presented, there seems to be a marked switch from ERb- and PELP-positive samples in the first analysis to ERb- and PELP-negative samples in the validation group. Was this possibly due to the high percentage of non-serous tissue samples in the first study? Did the authors, for test purposes, combine the 28 serous samples of the previous study with the 86 samples of the validation study or re-investigated this sample group separately?

Independent of the results it must be noted that a manuscript with 2 separate studies (a screening study and a validation study) may appear strange to readers who do not know the history of the manuscript. The Kaplan-Meier curves of the preliminary study remained as prominent results in the manuscript (Fig.3) and suggest a result that could not be confirmed in the validation study. The authors should find a better way to integrate old and new data because new readers of the manuscript will be puzzled.

**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:** Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.