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Reviewer’s report:

I congratulate the authors as they have significantly improved this manuscript by adding some clarifications.

I have only some minor suggestions to further improve the text.

Page 9 line 1 and 2: "scores over 6" and "scores less than 6": can you further clarify which category included scores of 6? I mean it would be helpful if you add "≤6" or "≥6" when appropriate.

Page 9 line 8: please change "significant" into "significance".

Page 14 line 6: please change "prognoses" into "prognosis".

Page 16 line 6: please change "expression" into "expressed".

Results section page 10 line 13-14: "These results imply that LGR5 expression is associated with cancer progression". I do not understand this statement, since the authors state that LGR5 expression was higher in normal breast tissue than in human breast cancer tissue (line 7-8 on page 10). Can the authors clarify why they state that LGR5 expression is associated with cancer progression? Is this statement based on higher LGR5 expression levels in TNBC than non-TNBC? I known TNBC have a poorer prognosis than non-TNBC, but the higher expression of LGR5 in normal breast tissue than in breast cancer does not corroborate your statement.

In addition: the quality of figure 1 is too poor to be able to read. Quality of all other figures is excellent. Could you please supply a figure 1 of better quality?

Many thanks for your invitation to review this interesting manuscript.
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