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Reviewer's report:

The authors have addressed my previously stated concerns in this revised manuscript. I only have a few additional comments on this revision:

Minor Essential Revisions:

1) In the Results when discussing “significant” amplifications and deletions (page 6-7), either a definition of what constitutes significant should be stated, or an explicit reference to the Methods section where this is defined should be made. In the description of significance in the Methods (Data Analysis section), I assume the q-values refer to the false discovery rate – this should be explicitly stated to avoid confusion.

2) In the Methods, when describing the association between expression and copy number, it would be better to be as explicit as in the reviewer’s comments about how the correlations were done. That is, state that a Spearman correlation was calculated independently in each dataset for each gene, followed by the Fisher’s combined probability test. I believe this will make this description clearer and will then correspond to Figure S1 more closely.

3) I appreciate the removal of the serous samples in the overlap analysis. But, I think it would be interesting to include as supplementary material or in the text how many of the amplifications and deletions seen in the non-serous histotypes were also seen in serous cancers. This would emphasize the uniqueness of alterations in these non-serous histotypes. My original intent was to point out that it would be premature to claim that the changes in the serous cancers were unique, but the opposite comparison is still valid.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
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