Dear Editor,

Article 'High PHLPP expression is associated with better prognosis in patients with resected lung adenocarcinoma' by Dongqing Lv et al. reports of correlation of high PHLPP expression with favorable outcome of patients with lung adenocarcinoma. It is an interesting study, in a field where definitely more adequate data is needed. However in the presented form I could not recommend acceptance of the manuscript.

Major revision:

1. Authors have to better explain staining evaluation for PHLPP, in more detail, and explain also in more details about evaluation of pAKT and pERK. What do they mean by “expressed mainly in cytoplasm/nucleus”? How do they then evaluate samples if they have one or the other or both expressions?

2. Another big issue for me is that all results seem not to be reported in Result section. They state correlation between PHLPP and pAKT and pERK, and PHLPP and survival, but nothing about tumor stage or grade. They only state in the Discussion section that there was correlation with tumor stage and differentiation. It would be nice to see it also as a graph.

3. At the end of Backgrounds they state the results, but expected results or tested hypothesis would be more appropriate.

4. In Immunohistochemistry section after manufacturer names, city and state should be written.

5. Also for Immunohistochemistry sections- where there any positive/negative controls used and which?

And the language needs to be thoroughly revised, while it is sometimes difficult to follow the manuscript.

Just some examples:

In Abstract, page 2, line 39…"medicaly operable stages” needs rephrasing (it occurs again on page 3, line 89)

Page 2, line 40/41 “expression of….was performed by…” maybe was evaluated or analyzed
In Background, page 2, line 63/64 “activated in cancer cell of cell types including human cancer cell” completely unclear.

In Discussion, page 5, line 165/66, what is tolerance therapy?

Kind regards,

Luka Brcic
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