Some questions about paper “Association between p53 codon 72 polymorphism and risk of oral squamous cell carcinoma in Asians: A meta-analysis” are shown below according to the paper topic:

- Background:
In Background was shown that “genetic predisposition is gaining increasing attention”. Indeed, the importance of genetic alterations in cancer pathogenesis is not new information. New studies are being conducted to better understand not only the influence of genetic alterations but also epigenetic changes. I think it is necessary to further enrich the first paragraph. I suggest change p53 to TP53 gene.

- Materials and Methods:
Inclusion Criteria:
What difference between OSCC diagnosed by “Histology or Pathology”? It is noteworthy that “Pathology” and “Histology” are areas of knowledge; is more appropriate to use histologic diagnosis. I suggest reviewing how to write the inclusion criteria in regard to diagnosis. Surgical biopsy followed by histopathology is considered the gold standard for diagnosing the oral lesions, including especially OSCC. Why it was included cases diagnosed by citologic diagnosis? Considering the limitations of molecular methods for genotyping, I think that genotyping
method should to be “inclusion criteria”. I suggest to perform analyzes using only a single method of genotyping. So, it will be possible to check if the results are independents of the molecular method. I suggest to specify more clearly in this topic, that in all selected study the studied population was Asian origin.

Search strategy:
The study did not indicate the time interval, which the studies surveyed were published. Only was pointed out that those articles were performed up to December 2013.

Why “codon 72” was not included as key word in search strategy, since this codon is one focus of the meta-analysis?

Data extraction:
It was not shown if there are criteria to guide discussion in situation of disagreements.
- Results:
Meta-analysis: in second line, change codon 73 to codon 72.
- Discussion:
It was very favorable the authors have acknowledged the limitations of the study I did not identify that this meta-analysis aimed to investigate TP53 gene as marker of invasion in OSCC. Why the results of this study were compared with Heah et al. (2011), given that the latter did not evaluate the TP53 codon72 polymorphism?
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