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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript Jin and colleagues set out to identify protein signatures that may improve the prognosis prediction for non-small cell lung carcinomas. They identify a 6-protein signature for adenocarcinoma and a 5-protein signature for squamous cell carcinoma. They conclude that the identified protein signatures could effectively stratify the prognosis of patients with non-small cell lung carcinomas. The authors aim to address an important question and undertook an interesting approach. I have a few comments that should be corrected:

1. The authors should discuss more on why the signature identified in C-Q Zhu, W Shih, J Clin Pathol. 2006 is different from their and what implications this may have.

2. The authors should tone down their conclusion as very bold statements are made including
   - 'To our knowledge, this is the first identification of protein signatures that precisely predict the prognosis of NSCLC patients.'

Well, it seems to work in the tested cohort but may equally not be useful for other cohorts.

3. References are missing after 'These 74 proteins/phospho-proteins plus CUEDC2, a potential oncogene that we identified and studied extensively'

4. The following references should be included which present important recent work in NSCLC field incl:

5. The references appear to be in different format and need to be changed for consistency.

6. Fig 4B is described twice in the text.
7. The discussion is poorly written with many repetitive paragraphs.

**Are the methods appropriate and well described?**
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Does the work include the necessary controls?**
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

**Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?**
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

**Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?**
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

**Quality of written English**
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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