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Reviewer's report:

Major compulsory revisions

The authors have modified the language in a minimal way, but I still think that the manuscript displays over-interpretation of the data.

For example:

"In conclusion, to the best of our knowledge, this is the first report to demonstrate that
286 the expressions of MDM2 and p16 in pretreatment biopsy specimens of advanced
287 ESCC patients were predictive markers for dCRT. In addition, this study revealed that
288 Ki-67 was also a prognostic marker for patients with advanced ESCC who underwent
289 dCRT. We hope that this study contributes to the treatment strategy of ESCC."

The data presented do not demonstrate that these are predictive biomarkers, but they do justify further investigation of these markers for their potential. I suppose what is needed is editing of the English to lessen the strength of the statements: so for example a more cautious wording of the above might read:

The results of this study suggest that MDM2 and p16 might have potential as predictive markers for chemoradioresistance in cStageIII ESCC and also that Ki-67 may also have a role as a putative prognostic marker following dCRT in cStageIII ESCC. Future studies might incorporate these potential biomarkers in trials to determine their effectiveness in formulating treatment strategies for patients with advanced ESCC.

Minor point:

degeneration of p53 is incorrect: the phrase should read degradation of p53.

Level of interest: An article whose findings are important to those with closely related research interests
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.
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