Reviewer’s report

Title: The kinetic profile and clinical implication of SCC-Ag in squamous cervical cancer patients undergoing radical hysterectomy using the Simoa assay: a prospective observational study

Version: 0 Date: 22 Oct 2019

Reviewer: Catharina M. Korse

Reviewer's report:

This is an extensive performed study in which the Simoa SCC-ag was compared with the Architect assay. Furthermore, the SCC-ag was investigated in a longitudinal study.

A few comments.

The description of the methods is incomplete. The method comparison is missing in the abstract.

The technical validations is well done, but before using the new assay, there must be done some more validations: There are no reference values, no Simoa SCC-Ag levels were measured in healthy volunteers. If the reference value is known, the sensitivity could be established. ROC-curves are recommended. So what do the authors mean with sensitivity?

Comparison between men and women is missing, comparison with age.

It's known that SCC-Ag is false positive if samples are contaminated with saliva or skin particles. Is that also shown in the Simoa assay?

I recommend the authors to consult a statistician for using the right words.

This kind of validations are mostly presented in 2 papers: one technical (including reference values, et cetera)

Minor:

Abstract: are the presented concentrations concerning the Simoa assay?

What are the intermediate and high-risk factors?

What are similar tendencies?

SCC-Ag is also available at other well-known platforms, such the Cobas assay from Roche. Add to references
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:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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