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Reviewer's report:

General
In the manuscript by S J-Jankovic et al a full scale comparative study of two previously established methods for DC generation for cancer vaccination is performed. DC based cancer vaccination is a promising strategy for the treatment of established cancer. A new fast method is compared with a method that has become standard in many laboratories. Since this fast method would make DC based cancer vaccination more rapid, less expensive and easier to perform it is important to evaluate this method in large scale production.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1: page 1, line 21: Not all the DC markers mentioned are DC marker, they are found on other cells as well.
2: page 2, line 8: , followed by maturation... this sentence is grammatically problematic.
3: page 2, line 13, In vitro.... It should be clarified that it is CD34+ cells from bone marrow etc that is used. Also, peripheral mononuclear cells are not a source, but monocytes from PBMC are!
4: page 4, line 8: Why didn't the authors use the same time length for maturation
5: page 6, line 13: ELISPOT assay must be described in more details. Against which cytokine, against which cells. Was pre-stimulated cells used, or was a direct ELISPOT assay, etc ??
6: page 6, line 18: Doesn't the length of cytoplasmic protrusions give some information on DC maturity and differences. This should be discussed.
7: page 8, line 19: significant should only be used if it its really statistically significant, based on significance tests!
8: The significance of different CD1a expression should be discussed.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
1: page 1, line 24: The T cell response is allospecific and therefore polyclonal. I wouldn't consider this response a " specific T-cell" a term which I think should be used to describe T cell responses on a clonal level.
2: page 4, line 11: were instead of was. Manus should be carefully checked for similar spelling mistakes
3: page 5, line 8: Describe source of EGFP
4: page 5, line 16: Did the authors use Fc block, or why not?
5: bonemarrow or bone marrow. Be consistent

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions

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

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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