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Reviewer's report:

This study reported the characterization of a newly established low-grade ovarian serous carcinoma cell lines from ascites of a 60-year-old patient. Cytogenetic and comparative hybridization using the Affymetric Cytoscan HD platform microarray were performed. The cell line appeared to have a slow doubling time of ~71 hours, and expressed TGF-beta1, CD73, CA125 and HE4. The total number of CNVs has slightly increased from 28 to 37 from primary malignant cells to established cell line CAISMOV24. Extensive genomic alterations were also detected in chromosomes 2,3,5,7, 8, 12, 13,14, 19, and X. The use of CNV is one of the established techniques to compare original carcinoma and established cell lines or PDX models. Thus, the use of CNV in this study is not novel. However, since a limited number of established low-grade ovarian serous carcinoma cell lines is available, a newly established low-grade ovarian serous carcinoma cell line (CAISOMV24) will be desirable. Additional characterization of this cell line will be important for investigators in the field. Exome sequencing and tumorigencity of the cell line in vivo are important basic characterization. It is not very clear if the cell line was derived from ascites of post-treatment patients or before treatment. An H&E of the original tumor showing low-grade histology will strength the authenticity that the cell line is derived from a low-grade serous carcinoma.
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