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Reviewer’s report:

Abstract and introduction are too long and needs to be shortened References are more than required

Results are negative as non expected and the number of patients could explain partially that

Authors must stress on tumor volume and histologic characteristics to find any correlation

this paper is not producing new of original data

> 1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined No
> 2. Are the methods appropriate and well described? Yes
> 3. Are the data sound? No
> 4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition? Yes
> 5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data? No
> 6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated? Yes
> 7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished? Probably
> 8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found? No
> 9. Is the writing acceptable? Certainly