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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this Comprehensive Bioinformatic Analysis, the authors evaluated the prognostic role of MIB1 in STAD and its association with immune infiltration and copy number variation. The topic is attractive to the related readers. The paper is written well: the Introduction part gives a good overview about the study background and the authors raised clearly the hypothesis of the study; the description of material studied is accurate. In addition, the aim of the study is fulfilled. The material studied is large enough and allows to draw the conclusions, as well. In short, the Results are presented clearly and have been discussed well. I have only one question, why did the authors initially choose Mind Bomb 1 to investigate?
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SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Title and key words - well chosen. 2. The abstract summarized and reflect the described in the manuscript. 3. Introduction contains the most important data to support the importance of the study. It is recommended to add more introductions about MIB1 to the first part of the text. 4. Material and methods - the paragraphs are generally well structured and explained. 5. Results section is well and clearly presented with pertinent statistics. 6. Discussion is well articulated according to results and the authors have clearly underlined the limitations and drawbacks of the manuscript. 7. Good quality of the Figures. However, In Table 1, only row 1 lists the n values for each group, but numbers are incorrect except for ‘T stage’, ‘Sex’ and ‘OS event’, please confirm that using only one n value throughout the table is reasonable? It is proposed to supplement the respective n values in the row for each item. 8. References --appropriate, latest and important.
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In this study, Di Wang et al revealed the complex role of MIB1 gene mutation and abnormal expression in the prognosis of GC. The result of the study is of interest that authors found that high expression of MIB1 can serve as a potential prognostic biomarker to identify gastric adenocarcinoma patients with poor clinical prognosis and may play a specific role in immune infiltration. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English.