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Reviewer's report:

The criticisms from my initial review have been largely addressed by the authors. Foremost, the numerous grammatical errors have been largely corrected.

I had concerns about the specificity of the RRIG-1 antibody and felt the use of a blocking peptide would improve confidence in the antibody specificity, although this was not performed, there is sufficient data to reasonably address this issue.

I still have issues with the semi-quantitative RT-PCR results in this paper, the paper would be strengthened if the authors stated the number of cycles used for each of the PCR reactions, not just for RRIG1, and also include a statement that for each of the PCR reactions they have demonstrated the cycles used produce a product in the linear range for comparison. This is especially true for the GAPDH control, since this is the only way we can verify equity of loading. The 32 cycles used for GAPDH, as the authors admit is likely out of the linear range, and conceivably could yield the same intensity of GAPDH band for even 10-fold differences in input reverse transcribed cDNA. This could affect the conclusions made for relative RRIG1, MMP, and SH3GLB2 expression. If the authors do not produce this data, I believe there is sufficient data presented for a critical reader to make their own conclusions as to the reliability of the data. My concerns are thus noted.
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