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Reviewer's report:

PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS:

OBJECTIVE - Full research articles: is there a clear objective that addresses a testable research question(s) (brief or other article types: is there a clear objective)?

No - there are minor issues

DESIGN - Is the current approach (including controls and analysis protocols) appropriate for the objective?

No - there are minor issues

EXECUTION - Are the experiments and analyses performed with technical rigor to allow confidence in the results?

No - there are major issues

STATISTICS - Is the use of statistics in the manuscript appropriate?

Yes - appropriate statistical analyses have been used in the study

INTERPRETATION - Is the current interpretation/discussion of the results reasonable and not overstated?

No - there are minor issues
OVERALL MANUSCRIPT POTENTIAL - Is the current version of this work technically sound? If not, can revisions be made to make the work technically sound?

Probably - with minor revisions

PEER REVIEWER COMMENTS:

GENERAL COMMENTS: In the presented study the authors investigated the role of SETD5 on NSCLC aggressiveness and survival time followed by experimental, clinical and literature sets. This study is interesting because NSCLC is still a leading issue for in contemporary oncology. However, I have some concerns with the methods of this study.

REQUESTED REVISIONS:

1. The major point is analysis and interpretation on enrolled patients. First of all 147 patients underwent surgery, but only 48 Non-cancerous tissues were obtained. In the table representing the studied group, we see the TNM staging. It is not according to 7th edition how authors suggested in material and methods section. The question is specific to the group marked as "III". Is it a IIIA group? Such patients only under the special condition could be qualified to surgery. Moreover, according to recent guidelines, IIIA patients should undergo neo- or adjuvant therapy. Therefore, please compare only patients I vs II (III may be independent unfavorable factor of OS). Additionally, some information about patients history after surgery should be added - "all patients received CTH after surgery..." was it adjuvant or maybe they were scheduled to CTH in the future when disease progressed? Any regimens of CTH should be added.

2. Please clarify the division of patients to positive/negative of SETD5. "A final score of 0-12 was obtained by multiplying the intensity and percentage scores" - if you multiplied the total should be 14? and in next sentence "Tumors were seen as positive for SETD5 expression with a score ≥4", so if 4 per 12 were passed patient was considered as positive? For me it is a little confusing. I also suggest for survival analysis: three groups according to points: negative(weak), moderate, positive (strong).

Minor points:

1. Large cell carcinoma patient should be excluded from the study, its presence does not affect results.

2. In some samples the differences of SETD5 was found - cytoplasm rather than nucleus - please discuss why?
3. Limitations of the study should be added, and potential effect of SETD5 inhibition in cancer therapy.

4. There are language mistakes, that need to be polished before publication.

Note: This reviewer report can be downloaded - see attached pdf file.

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

No

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

No

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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