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Reviewer’s report:

The revised version was improved but there are still language issues as well as confused statements that need to be fixed prior to publication.

In the abstract, authors stated they found 30% amplification in WWOX locus while it is deletion according to the data!

In the Introduction, authors stated: “The overall recurrent gene copy alteration pattern of these two independent populations in two different countries (China and Canada) were very similar, suggesting distinct genetic alterations underlying the pathogenesis of OS [23]”. It is not clear how it is distinct (different) if the CNVs are very similar? Authors need to better describe what they mean.

In the discussion, when referring to correlation between IHC and aCGH on WWOX, for example, it is fair to say that this result (absence of statistical association) could also stem from the low sample numbers. Authors can cite the following review article that further discuss this issue: Am J Cancer Res 2011;1(5):585-594.

In the discussion, It is more correct to write that: “Further evidence for this was found by Aqielan and colleagues [14].”

In the discussion, it was confused: “We therefore hypothesize that negative expression of RUNX2 protein might be due to pre-treatment, including chemotherapy” instead, it should post-treatment.

Frequently, IHC is confused with ICH.

In the discussion, it should say that VEGFA is known as a target of RUNX2. Also provide reference.

In the conclusion, authors stated: “we report for the first time, correlation between WWOX, RUNX2 and VEGFA in human OS, in situ.” and in the sentence they stated: “No significant correlation was observed between these three genes with respect to gene copy number aberration”. This is confusing and should be rephrased.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

Declaration of competing interests:

'I declare that I have no competing interests'