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Reviewer's report:

This is a study which details establishment of a Clear cell sarcoma (CCS) cell line (Hewga-CCS) that has developed a model to enable comprehensive bench-side investigation. This is a good study and should be published. However, there are some concerns as follows that in my opinion should be addressed before the manuscript is accepted for publication.

Pg-8: Beginning : How many times the chromosomal analysis of the cells was performed in the span of 36 months ? At what passage numbers ? The authors may be asked to mention in the MSS……

Pg-8 Beginning: the attached cells continuously expressed the EWS-ATF1 transcript (data not shown). The authors have measured EWS-ATF1 transcript. What was the state with respect to ATF-2 and ATF-3 transcripts ? (the authors have mentioned the same in introduction) The authors may be asked to mention in the MSS……

Methods: Pg. 8 beginning : The authors mention “Throughout the establishment of this cell line, the attached cells continuously expressed the EWS-ATF1 transcript (data not shown).” In Genetic analysis: (Pg. 9)

EWS-ATF1 cDNA was identified by polymerase chain reaction (PCR) using EWS forward primer 5'-TCC TAC AGC CAA GCT CCA AGT C and ATF1 reverse primer 5'-ACT CGG TTT TCC AGG CAT TTC AC.

The Authors performed direct sequencing of the PCR product.

Results:

Figure 1D shows that the Type 2 control matches at 464 bp in Hewga CCS cells.

Figure 1E shows that the authors obtained Type 2 fusion transcript.

Thus, the authors could get type 2 fusion transcript. This is contrary to the one mentioned in Methods. The authors therefore may be asked to bring the same in the MSS at all appropriate locations.

This is a good study and should be published.

Final Report: The manuscript can be published with Minor Essential Revisions.

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
Yes, the question posed by the authors is well defined.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
Yes, all possible methods have been employed to get the results in the study.

3. Are the data sound?
Yes, quite sound data and proved by all possible methods with statistics.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
Yes, this manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
Yes, authors have carefully gone thorough all possible comparison with existing studies and futuristic approach also is discussed in the discussion.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
Yes, authors have also mentioned about the limitations as well.

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?
Yes, clearly acknowledgement has been written with both published and unpublished.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
Yes, perfect correlation has been observed between title and abstract.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
Yes, the manuscript is acceptable with minor changes and it should be published.

Final report: The manuscript can be published with Minor Essential Revisions.