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Reviewer's report:

Dear authors,
Thank you for taking the time to address my previous concerns, and the additional effort with the new discussion section. I just have a few minor points, which should be very easy to fix:

1. Figure 1 –What are the black samples that cluster together with the 4 normal-like (green) samples? Are they also normal? If they are misclassifications of the other subtypes, they should still be indicated with the respective colours.

2. Missing word “to” – 2nd line under “Prognostic Significance…..” section: .....Her2/ERBB2, we wanted to assess....

Discretionary Revision:
3. For last line of results, based on fig 6C, authors might be more bold instead and directly claim that the RT-PCR for ESR is more prognostic and accurate than IHC for ER.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable

Statistical review: No, the manuscript does not need to be seen by a statistician.
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