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**Reviewer's report:**

First of all I would like to emphasize that this article has been well written and thought through with regards to the methods of analysis. However I do think some major essential revisions should be done.

1. Is it well known that endometrioid ovarian neoplasm have better survival prognosis as compared to serous epithelial ovarian neoplasms! Isn't it logical to find correlation with improved disease free / overall survival when human mamaglobin B is strongly correlated with endometrioid ovarian cancers? This should be further declared or noted in the discussion

2. On page 7 it is stated that only 98 tumor samples contained at least 70% neoplastic epithelial cells. What happened with the other 8 ovarian tumor tissues and why were they excluded with less than 70% neoplastic epithelial cells? Please explain.

3. On page 9 also omental metastases were included for total RNA extraction, why not the primary ovarian tissue?

4. In the discussion it should be mentioned that by dividing the different histopathological groups, the numbers became small and results should be interpreted with caution. (max no of patients per group is 54 most groups < 20 pts)

5. In table 4 and the result section; the presence of ascites and involvement of lymph nodes had a significant impact on DFS, OS, PFS. Isn't this logical at it is generally known that FIGO staged matters and these component; positive lymph nodes and ascites are contained in FIGO stage? If the author wishes to leave this data unchanged a comment on this issue should be stated in the discussion section.

6. With regards to the statistics I do think the ROC and univariate and multivariate analysis are the right approach. However I am still not a statistician.

7. The discussion should include a section where is discussed how to optimally measure mammaglobulin B in ovarian cancer patients (HOSE, PCR?) with regard to the results of this paper.

8. An earlier study should be discussed (ref18). These authors were unable to find a significant difference between the mammaglobulin B expression between the different histopathology. Why did the authors of this paper did find a difference?

In conclusion this paper is worthwhile publishing however some critical notes
should be incorporated before accepting.

**Level of interest:** An article of importance in its field

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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

**Declaration of competing interests:**

I declare I have no competing interests' below