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Reviewer's report:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?

The authors seek to find biological markers that could be of potential prognostic or diagnostic value for pulmonary neuroendocrine tumours. They focus their attention on the EMT process and the factors involved in it as a potential source of biochemical markers. This seems to be a good choice, given the involvement of that process in the early steps of tumour spread. They hypothesized that some of those might show different expression levels among the clinical subgroups of interest. This question is well defined from the beginning of the manuscript.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?

To contrast their hypothesis the authors use an appropriate technique, immunohistochemistry, widely used in the clinical setting and thus adequate in case the results were found of direct application.

3. Are the data sound?

Reported results are derived from the study of a large cohort of samples and include a multivariate data statistical analysis. These requirements contribute to data robustness.

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

The authors follow the REMARK guidelines (REporting recommendations for tumor MARKer prognostic studies) which are well established indications for publishing.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported
by the data?

Among the results obtained the authors discuss them in the context of the clinical utility and cautiously include the most outstanding ones in their conclusion.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?

7. Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

Yes

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?

Yes, they do

9. Is the writing acceptable?

Yes, it is easily understood

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

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

**Statistical review:** Yes, and I have assessed the statistics in my report.
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