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Reviewer's report:

In this manuscript Gai et al describe the identification of EV-associated miRNA in the saliva of oral cancer patients. Although the sample size is rather small, the study is generally well-conducted (with one caveat, below) and several candidate miRNA identified which could be validated in a larger cohort. The authors conduct pathway analysis based on computational prediction of potential targets and associated biological function; to my mind this adds little to the manuscript. Overall, however, this is a well-written manuscript describing essentially preliminary findings that will, none-the-less, be of interest in the field, which is currently vibrant due to the urgent need to identify novel biomarkers for early detection of oral cancer. I have a few comments, the first of which must be addressed to ensure the validity of this study:

1) How was the TLDA data normalized? This is not a trivial detail and is not described in the methods.

2) More detail should be provided on the EV isolation procedure rather than just referring to a previous paper.

3) On p8, RNA quality is referred to as 'good'. What does this mean and how was it assessed?

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.

Yes
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:
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