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Reviewer’s report:

The authors tested and compared qPCR, FISH, CISH, and SISH for large sets of samples. The paper is well written. The question posed by the authors well defined and practical. The content fits to the journals which has the readers involved in practice, such as lab technician and practicing pathologists.  
1. The methods are appropriate and well described, but the numbers of the cases for each technology is markedly different.
2. The data are mostly sound, but some area seems to be unclear.
   Concordance with CISH seems to be not very high. 98% and 75% for CISH (108 and 204 cases)
3. The manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition.
4. Discussion and conclusions are well balanced and adequately supported by the data limitations of the work are clearly stated. The authors miss some previous and relevant work in minor literatures such as Kiyose S, et al. Pathol Int. 2012 Nov;62(11):728-34 and Bastien RR et al. BMC Med Genomics. 2012 Oct 4;5:44. doi: 10.1186/1755-8794-5-44.
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