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Reviewer's report:

The authors investigate the prognostic and biological significance of circ-SMARCA5 in MM. The topic of the manuscript is interesting and add new insight to the pathobiology of multiple myeloma.

I have the following concerns:

- It is not clear the rationale of the study and why the authors focused on circ-SMARCA5.

- Please increase description on non-coding RNAs and circ-RNAs in the Introduction section.

- the cutoff for high and low circ-SMARCA5 in myeloma patients should be explained.

- the nomenclature NC-, NC+, circ+ and circ- should be changed because it is not easily understandable for readers.

- it should be appropriate that gain and loss of function experiments are carried out in different cell lines, respectively with low and high circ-SMARCA5 levels.

- Blots are not properly cut, and densitometric analysis should be reported.

- The term "compensation experiments" is uncommon and should be replaced.
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.

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Not suitable for publication unless extensively edited
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