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Reviewer's report:

This is an interesting investigation of Y-box protein-1/p18 fragment in plasma in patients with malignancies. The manuscript is easy to understand for reader. It is good point. However, I believe the manuscript could be improved by addressing several issues described below:

Major comments
1. It did not provide a story or strong rationale for the current study. I think more effort needs to be made to provide a rationale about the importance and novelty of this study in introduction.
2. Part of introduction is too long and has no mention of the main issue.
3. What is YB-1/p18 fragment? Which part in the full length of YB-1?
4. Which part of epitope for their newly established monoclonal YB-1 antibody?
5. What is the function for YB-1/p18 fragment?
6. Where is the localization of YB-1/p18 fragment?
7. Aim of authors is clinical use. If so, they should discuss the action assignment and interpretation such as the difference of local existence of YB-1/p18 fragment and measurement means with citation use (Yoshimatsu, et al, Anticancer Res. 2005, Shibahara et al, Clin Cancer Res. 2001, Hyogotani et al, Clin Lung Cancer. 2012)
8. How authors get the obtaining written informed consent from healthy blood donors?
9. What would the investigators propose as the next step in evaluating this marker for clinical usefulness? Please discuss the clinical impact.

Minor comments
1. How authors select randomly the patients in this study? Consecutive patients?
2. Below sentence is too difficult to understand for readers. (For instance, in patients with lung cancers b2-microglobulin ……depending on the underlying histology (Fig.4).) To begin with, b2-microglobulin was not the tumor markers tested most frequently.
3. Author should change the Figure 5 from Figure to graph including the CT graphical content to understand for readers.
4. Author should discuss the prognostic impact with the object of organ specific.
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