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Dear editor

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript “Increased expression of MMP9 is involved in poor prognosis of nasopharyngeal carcinoma” (manuscript #: 5213987953204447) again. The reviewers' constructive comments and suggestions are also highly appreciated. In this modification, we revised carefully our manuscript (especially in discussion section) according to the reviewers' and editor’s suggestions (Yellow marker highlights the key changes). In addition, we invited 2 native English speaking scientists from NIH and MD Anderson Cancer Center to copyedit our manuscript. The following is our point-by-point responses to the reviewers’ comments.

Reviewer 1:
1. About the title of this manuscript: The wording ".... is correlated with...." is more appropriate than the wording "....is involved in...."
   Response: According to the reviewer’s suggestion, "is involved in" was changed to "is correlated with".

2. Page 6, line 5 (from the bottom): "..... poorer survival that those with lower...." should be read as "......poorer survival than those with lower..."
   Response: we revised the error.

3. page 7, line 1 (from the bottom): "...presented the proof that ...." should be read as ".....presented the evidence that....".
   Response: According to the reviewer’s suggestion, "...presented the proof that ...." was changed to ".....presented the evidence that....".

4. Page 9, 2nd paragraph, line 1: delete "first"
   Response: We deleted “first”.

Reviewer 2
1. The discussion section needs to be improved considerably. The authors just
relate data from the literature. There is no real reflexion on their findings according to previous studies. Some errors (typing, spelling..) still exist in the revised version

Response: In this revision, we modified carefully the discussion section and revised some errors, such as” typing, spelling”. In addition, we invited 2 native English speaking scientists from NIH and MD Anderson Cancer Center to copyedit our manuscript.