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Dear Editor:

Regarding this manuscript: “HER2 overexpression and amplification is present in a subset of ovarian mucinous carcinomas and can be targeted with trastuzumab therapy”, authors: Jessica N McAlpine, Kimberly C Wiegand, Russell Vang, Brigitte M Ronnett, Anna Adamiak, Martin Kobel, Kenneth D Swenerton, David G Huntsman, C Blake Gilks and Dianne M Miller.

I would like to express my comments:

1. Is the question posed by the authors well defined?
   a. Yes, it is.

2. Are the methods appropriate and well described?
   a. Yes, the methods are described adequately.

3. Are the data sound?
   a. The results observed by the authors are similar that those reported by another.

4. Does the manuscript adhere to the relevant standards for reporting and data deposition?
   a. Yes, but a previously report informed results from 142 samples’s tissues of mucinous ovarian carcinoma.

5. Are the discussion and conclusions well balanced and adequately supported by the data?
   a. Regarding the role of trastuzumab in mucinous ovarian cancer, I feel that the conclusions do not have a solid base since 2 patients were only dealt with the monoclonal antibody. On the other hand, the utility of the HER2 as prognostic factor was recognized in cases with recurrence, but the finding was observed in a small number of cases.

6. Are limitations of the work clearly stated?
   a. Yes, it is.

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 Do the authors clearly acknowledge any work upon which they are building, both published and unpublished?

[End of text]
a. Yes they do.

8. Do the title and abstract accurately convey what has been found?
   a. Yes, it do.

9. Is the writing acceptable?
   a. Yes, it is.

I recommend to fit the conclusions to a become attached state but with the findings observed in the analysis and not only by the clinical experience that the authors had when trying 2 patients. Nevertheless, it is important to let the door to designed clinical trials open. I consider that the changes that the authors must perform must be considered like essential minor revisions.

I am thankful for the opportunity and the offered confidence to allow to review this interesting study.

Alberto Serrano, MD.