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Reviewer's report:

In this study by Jin et al., the authors examined a protein signature in resected adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma NSCLC patients from two independent institutions using immunohistochemistry staining of FFPE tumour blocks. The expression levels of 75 critical proteins was examined using the appropriate test and validation sample cohorts. A 6- and 5-protein signature was deduced for adenocarcinoma and SCC patients respectively, which could stratify the prognosis of NSCLC patients, in addition to supporting patient selection for adjuvant chemotherapy.

The manuscript is well-written and scientifically & technically sound. However, it is recommended that the authors address the following queries in relation to Figures 4 & 5, as outlined as follows:

Figure 4: While Figure 4A is labelled for stages IB, II and IIIA adenocarcinoma patients having good prognosis, the legend for this figure indicates that "...(A) ADC patients at stages II and IIIA...". Furthermore, the legend continues to indicate that "The overall survival of the patients with or without adjuvant chemotherapy in the good-prognosis (B) and poor-prognosis (C) group was analyzed". However, in this particular figure, there does not appear to be a figure corresponding to Figure "C"?

Figure 5: It would appear that some text is missing from the legend for Figure 5. This may not be the case, but would recommend that the authors verify this and correct where necessary. For example..."Histograms of the ?? value from the log-rank test on ADC testing set (A) and SCC testing set (B) were illustrated. The x axis indicates the ?? value".
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