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Reviewer's report:

• Major Compulsory Revisions

The author should make clear in the METHODS SECTION:

“The specimens were divided into three groups. The first group used the standard method in the laboratory (U-SQ). In this method, unstained FFPE tissue was scraped with a razor blade followed by extraction with the QIAamp kit. The second and third groups employed deparaffinization and H&E staining of the slides followed by tissue harvest using the Pinpoint reagent. The specimen was then divided two parts for extraction of gDNA, one half with the Qiagen kit (Pinpoint harvest with QIAamp column extraction, H-PQ) and the other half with the Zymo kit (Pinpoint harvest with Zymo column extraction, H-PZ) as described above. The tissue harvested for each test group was taken from different levels of the same region on the slide to minimize variation in cellular density.”

Whereas the author described this information in the RESULTS SECTION, one should think of shifting this paragraph or inform again briefly.

• Minor Essential Revisions

1. These changes included in the “Major Compulsory Revisions” could be extended to ABSTRACT SECTION briefly.

2. The author could better discuss in the third paragraph of DISCUSSION SECTION the result of “Stain-Harvest/Column(H-PZ)= 109.0 Average DNA yield (ng/mm2) with 1.89 260nm/280nm - Statistically significant lower yield (p=0.0005)” in comparison with “Stain-Harvest/Column(U-SQ)= 555.0 Average DNA yield (ng/mm2) with 1.92 260nm/280nm” and “Stain-Harvest/Column(H-PQ)= 505.0 Average DNA yield (ng/mm2) with 1.84 260nm/280nm”.

3. The author could include this RESULTS “statistically significant lower yield” in the CONCLUSION

4. The formatting of the last paragraph of RESULTS SECTION is incorrect.
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