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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
This manuscript presented the novel prognosis markers in breast cancer by re-analysis of The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA). The authors show the hub genes of DEGs by network analysis. Several hub genes correlated to poor prognosis in breast cancer. The presented study is organized well. However, there are several concerns for the publication. The authors should address all my concerns.

Major comments
1. The authors show the hub genes by network analysis. The hub genes is derived by calculation of the network centrality. The authors should show the type of centrality which presented in the work.
2. Survival analysis of hub genes is showed as Kaplan-Meier plots. The authors should show the clinical dataset which used in the study, and describe the details of clinical dataset. Additionally, the authors should show the survival analysis of the hub genes in TCGA breast cancer dataset with molecular subtypes of breast cancer.
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS
Manuscript were well-written and data were nicely interpreted. The only one minor issue is the small font size of Figure 2. It will be great if they can find a way to show the data with larger font size. Other than that, I have no further question.