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Reviewer's report:

General
The manuscript shows some improvement concerning some of the previously raised points. However, several requirements have not been met to warrant publication. These requirements are listed below. In addition, spelling and grammatical errors persist throughout in the manuscript, which makes reading and deciphering of the authors' message rather laborious.

Major Compulsory Revisions
1. Introduction, pp2: “Fibronectin (FN) is a kind of glucoprotein for adhesive attraction” Phrasing is awkward. Is glucose the only carbohydrate attached to fibronectin? (The appropriate term seems to be glycoprotein).

2. Introduction, pp2: “Previous studies have shown that FN anchoring on ECM in vitro plays an important role in cancer cell chemotaxis (ref 7). This reference (JBC, 281:29614) shows induction of MMP9 by fibronectin in human lung carcinoma cells, which may (indirectly) have effects on cell migration, but does not seem to support the statement in the Introduction.

3. Figure 6, A-1. The integrin B1 blot is not convincing. In the previous version of the manuscript, bands were barely visible. In this version, signal concerning rhFNHC36 (50; 100 and 200) is not exploitable due to high background.

4. Point #3, Major Compulsory Revisions from the first review: Two references have been added at the end of the corresponding paragraph in the M&M sections. Although it is not formally stated, one has to assume that the whole lungs where embedded in paraffin and analyzed, as described in ref #21? However, the M&M does not address all the raised questions. Importantly, as results show slight but statistically significant difference in metastasis of rhFNHC36 or 29 with respect to the other groups, it is methodologically sound to inform the reader about the following points, that I copy-paste from my previous review: Upon microscopic counting of metastatic foci, how many observers performed counts? Were counts performed blindly? How was inter-observer variability assessed?

Minor:
1. Background: Three lines above the last paragraph. Squares after the words Cell and Hep ??
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