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Many thanks for the positive evaluation and for providing us an opportunity to revise the Manuscript “Expression of tumor-specific antigen MAGE, GAGE and BAGE in ovarian cancer tissues and cell lines” (5985010123166262).

We appreciate very much your important decision and reviewers’ comments for the original manuscript. We have finished the revision according to your and reviewers’ comments and now return the revised version (5985010123166262) with the response to the reviewers. In this version, we have carefully addressed all points raised by the reviewers and make detailed revisions according to the suggestions. Our specific responses and the corresponding changes to each of the points are summarized on the following response sheet addressing to the reviewers and the changes in the revised manuscript have been marked in RED font and underline.

In summary, the manuscript has been thoroughly revised and the concerns raised by the reviewers have been addressed carefully on a point-by-point basis. We believe that the revision has significantly improved the quality of the manuscript and hope that it will be accepted for publication. Thank you for your considerations.

Yours sincerely
Responses to the comments raised by reviewer Yao-Tseng Chen:

Reviewer’s report:

I am satisfied with the revised manuscript, but two minor revisions need to be made:

1. In the abstract, ”26.8% (11/47)”, should be ”26.8% (11/41)”.

2. The 7 (6?) cases of so-called "metastatic lesions", the author previously clarify that this group of cases are primary tumors of other sites that have metastasized to ovary, including 4 GI cancers. But now they called them "metastatic lesions of ovarian cancer", which has a totally different meaning. All "metastatic lesions of ovarian cancers", both in the text and in the table, should be changed to "metastatic carcinoma involving ovary", to correctly describe this group of tumors.

Dear reviewer Yao-Tseng Chen,

We appreciate very much your careful review, constructive comments and kind corrections to our
manuscript (5985010123166262). We have revised the manuscript according to your comments and incorporated all corrections which were marked with RED font and underline in the revised version. The detailed point-by-point answers to your concerns are below.

I am satisfied with the revised manuscript, but two minor revisions need to be made:

1. In the abstract, "26.8% (11/47)", should be "26.8% (11/41)".

Re: I corrected it.

2. The 7 (6?) cases of so-called "metastatic lesions", the author previously clarify that this group of cases are primary tumors of other sites that have metastasized to ovary, including 4 GI cancers. But now they called them "metastatic lesions of ovarian cancer", which has a totally different meaning. All "metastatic lesions of ovarian cancers", both in the text and in the table, should be changed to "metastatic carcinoma involving ovary", to correctly describe this group of tumors.

Re: In the last revision, according to reviewer Yao-Tseng Chen’s comments, I had deleted the 6 cases of metastatic ovarian cancer (such as Krukenberg tumor). In this revision, the 7 cases of metastatic lesions of ovarian cancers are the primary ovarian tumors that metastasized to other sites, so it needs no change.