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Reviewer's report:

The manuscript by Cho et al., have investigated API5 expression in cervical cancer, and the clinical significance of API5 and its relationship with phosphorylated ERK1/2 (pERK1/2) in development and progression of cervical cancer.

The manuscript is interesting. However, the data on cell lines has been mixed with clinical data and thus cell line data falls short of important findings/conclusions. Thus, the manuscript needs some major revisions. Most importantly, the text needs major revisions from grammar point of view.

1. There is a lot of confusion in cell lines. Abstract: Line 53. HEK 293 is not a cervical cancer cell line and now it is not considered to be non-tumorigenic. You could repeat with human PBMCs or HaCaT cells.
2. In methods section, H1299 cells are mentioned in experimental protocol when there is no expt. done with it.
3. Why the term various cervical cancer cell lines is used when only two have been used for in vitro experiments. Why SiHa was not taken? Why only HeLa was used for siRNA studies and not CaSki?
4. When expression of AP15 in CaSki is same as HEK 293, how do you see it in localization studies (data not mentioned)? How is it explained?
5. Discussion part has lot of spelling errors. Proper references are not given at relevant places e.g. lines 347-349

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.
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