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Manuscript: Immunohistochemical staining of radixin and moesin in prostatic adenocarcinoma

This is an interesting work. I would suggest some changes to improve and make more effective the article.

I propose minor essential revisions

The authors could explain why in the two groups (one for radixin and one for moesin) there are not the same number of the tissue samples.

In the section of material and methods the authors should describe where is the staining of the cells, in fact it not clearly specified

Why the authors used different not parametric tests (One-Way ANOVA for Radixin and Kruskal-Wallis for Moesin) to compare the different groups of tissue

When the authors used the Stage of carcinoma they should specify if they have used the TNM or not; and if the used tissue was obtained from radical prostatectomy or from other surgical specimens because they use stage less the 2 and this is impossible in the case of radical prostatectomy.

The authors could expand the discussion and/or conclusions to explain the differences that they found between PIN (pre-neoplastic lesions) and the carcinoma.

They also could add a reference about Merlin (Curr Protein Pept Sci. 2010 September 1; 11(6): 471–484.) and the authors should briefly explain what is Merlin.

The Figure 7 has not a good quality. The authors described in B a diffuse staining in the cytoplasm that is not evident. It could be useful to make a panel with PIN, normal and carcinoma.
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