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Author’s response to reviews:
Dear Dr. Gummlich, and Dr. Smith,

We thank the reviewers and editors for this new feedback on our paper. We have revised the manuscript considering the new comments. As request, we were able to shorten the article a lot, but the number of co-authors has not been reduced, since all of them had relevant contributions, without which the work could not have been developed. This paper had the important collaboration of oncologists and pathologists from participating hospitals and technicians from Barretos, in addition to the need for students to acquire patient data. Thus, we have the understanding that we do not think it is elegant to exclude any co-author. In addition, we changed the status of the second author (Dr. Elaine Stur) to the second first author. Unfortunately, our paper or any other published paper up to date not have addressed a retrospective follow-up about the 3 genes (FGF2, GAS1, and SFRP1) as suggest in original review by Dr. Cohen, containing type of treatment (excision vs mastectomy), length of follow up which should be 10-20 years, grade, ER and HER2 status, cost to perform, how long to of the test, and technical skill), in both tissues (DCIS pure and IDC). We agree with Dr. Cohen, that it would be very interesting to have a functional study of these genes as well as a retrospective clinical study but is not available at this moment. Therefore, these follow-up data (the complete retrospective clinical study about these 3 genes with all these information) were not included in our paper. We also addressed the questions raised by Dr. Schwartz.

We appreciate the consideration of this revised submission and look forward to hearing back from you.
RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWERS

A list of responses to each comment/query has been provided below and the manuscript was revised in accordance with those responses. Changes made in the previous submission have been highlighted in yellow to facilitate tracking (except the exclusions). We appreciate the consideration of this revised submission.

REVIEWER 2

Comment 1

The paper does not appear to have been shortened.

Response: We were able to remove 1043 words and now the main text (from background to conclusion) has 1882 words. To reduce the number of words, we include a new abbreviation (DEG - differently expressed gene); we removed some information in the discussion, results and material and methods, always taking care not to remove any information relevant to the understanding of the paper; we changed some sentences to be more summarized and we passed one table and two figures for supplementary material. With these changes, we withdraw 26 references. The entire reference numbering was changed and revised. As explained above, all the co-authors made important contributions to the work, so we very much hope that all them are on the list of authors.

Comment 2

In response to my query about why the 7th edition of the AJCC staging manual was used rather than the 8th, the authors added a reference about the 8th edition.

There are several new issues with this. The authors did not use the staging in the 8th edition (which has two pathologic stagings: Anatomic and Pathologic Prognostic), so reference 13 is misleading. The authors should simply explain why they used the 7th edition rather than the newer 8th edition.

Furthermore, Reference 13 is an article about the new staging manual, not the actual manual.

For the record the correct reference for the 8 edition is

And the corrected chapter on breast available as a free online download is:

https://cancerstaging.org/About/news/Pages/Updated-Breast-Chapter-for-8th-Edition.aspx

Response: As discussed in the previous revision, we used the current version of the AJCC manual during the sample selection (that is, in 2015). The 8th edition was included in the references, was read and evaluated to see if we could include anything of it, but the selection criteria really remained only with the 7th edition. We actually read an article that is taken up as news from the new edition of the manual and not the complete manual. Thank you for sending the manual link. Anyway, we kept only the reference of the 7th edition and removed the 8th edition of the references, since we do not use its criteria. Also in order to make the use of the 7th version clear in the body of the article, we have included the sentence "current edition in 2015" on page 4 - line 75.