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Reviewer's report:

Jin et al report the identification of prognostic signatures for both lung ADC and SCC based on immunohistochemical analysis of protein expression. They generate two models, one for ADC (6 proteins) and one for SCC (5 proteins), and demonstrate they validity in an independent cohort of patients. Moreover, they results also suggest that the ADC signature is useful for the selection of patients who would benefit from adjuvant chemotherapy. The authors have also elaborated a web tool in which the performance of the antibodies, the results and the functioning of the prognostic indexes can be evaluated.

This is a very interesting study, with a meritorious amount of work, clearly presented and with conclusions well supported by the results.

I have not major concerns with this study, only minor questions that may improve the quality of the work:

- Some additional analyses may be considered, such as the performance of the signatures in each stage separately or only in patients no treated with adjuvant therapy. Especially, I wonder if the capacity of the signatures to predict benefit from adjuvant therapy may improve when the different stages are analyzed separately.

- Page 8, line 47: "peroxide" should be "peroxidase"

- For SCC, a figure equivalent to figure S3 is missed

- Page 20, line 23: "AUC: ROC curve" should be "AUC: Area under the curve"

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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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.
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Quality of written English
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