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Reviewer’s report:

The authors’ manuscript deals with the caveolin 1 expression in renal cancer. Results collected from nearly 300 tissue specimen indicated a negative correlation between cytoplasmic caveolin 1 expression and patient prognosis. The article provides interesting and novel information and is well structured. I have just few minor concerns which should be taken care of.

Minor Essential Revisions:
Abstract, methods: The term IQR should be written out in full when mentioned the first time. It should also be explained that both cytoplasmic and membranous caveolin was analyzed.

Abstract, results: The formulation “higher than average” and “higher and lower than average” is difficult to understand. How is “average” defined?

Introduction: CAV1 should be written out in full the first time (introduction, third para) and replaced by CAV1 thereafter (introduction, last para).

Procedure: The definition of staining intensity 4 and 2 is not clear and should be better explained.

Results, first chapter, second para: The difference between “a high CAV1 expression” (first line) and “a higher than average CAV1 expression” (third line) should be explained. Secondly, how is “average” defined?

Table 1+2: CAV1 staining is given as “cytoplasm < median” and “cytoplasm > median”. Does it mean that “cytoplasm < median” includes scoring values 0,1,2,3, whereas “cytoplasm > median” is related to scoring values 4+5?

Discussion, third para: “Previously, we were able to show....” should be underlined by a reference.
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Quality of written English: Acceptable
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Declaration of competing interests:
I declare that I have no competing interests.