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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?
Yes - there is a clear objective

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?
Yes - the approach is appropriate

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?
No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?
No - there are issues with the statistics in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?
No - there are minor issues

OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?
Maybe - with major revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: The study design is overall sound. The findings are fine and expected in light of current knowledge in the field. Data interpretation lacks depth. there is room for major improvements.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
The authors are comparing AC to MAC and SRCC prognoses in data from SEER database (2004-2015). In the results section, the authors are lumping MAC and SRCC in their comparisons to AC. Since the values of MAC vs. AC differences were less dramatic than those of SRCC vs. AC, these two entities need to be presented separately in the results section, as it is in Table 3. Moreover, the authors need to run another comparison of MAC vs. SRCC as well. This reviewer expects that the difference will be significant and will affect the emphasis that the authors are putting on the mucin production
alone as the main factor for the difference in prognoses. Moreover, the discussion part on the molecular profiles within each of these 3 histologies is shallow and needs further development if really these histologies are associated with specific molecular profiles.

ADDITIONAL REQUESTS/SUGGESTIONS:

The manuscript writing needs a thorough revision. There are many typos and grammatical errors, some of which affect even the presented science e.g. are distinction should be are distinct, patients with MAC patients should be patients with MAC histology, on page 8 line 56: when compared to AC NOT to MAC, and many more mistakes all over that need fixing).

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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