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**Reviewer's report:**

Major Compulsory Revisions:

1) Prognosis value of biomarkers cannot be determined without a follow-up study
2) Sample sizes are too small (particularly for the group I)
3) Providing a table presenting patient’s characteristics makes it easier for readers to grasp majority of information.
4) Statistical analysis is inappropriate to draw meaningful conclusions. Univariate and multivariate analysis should be done and Kaplan Meier curves should be added.
5) It should underlined that a p value = 0.059 is not statistically significant but could be analyzed as a trend.

Minor Essential Revision:

1) “CGA appears to be the best overall tissue and serum marker of neuroendocrine differentiation”. Could you corroborate this affirmation with recent references?

Discretionary Revisions:

1) Figures are dispensable

**Level of interest:** An article of limited interest

**Quality of written English:** Acceptable

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