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Editor in Chief
BMC Cancer
Dear Sir,

Enclosed please find the electronic copy of the revised manuscript (MS: 8959632347543217) “The effects of fluorouracil, epirubicin, and cyclophosphamide (FEC60) on the intestinal barrier function and gut peptides in breast cancer patients: an observational study” by Francesco Russo et al together with a point-by-point reply to the referees.

The paper has been revised according to the referees’ suggestions and we hope it is now suitable for publication in BMC Cancer.

Thank you for your interest in our paper and for the referees’ constructive criticism.

Sincerely yours,
Giuseppe Riezzo, MD
Editorial Requirements:

The name of ethics committee:
Ethics Committee of the National Institute for Digestive Diseases IRCCS "S. de Bellis"
Castellana Grotte, Bari, Italy, 70013.

Reviewer’s comments - minor issues:

Q1. Firstly, although very well written there are a few occasions where the English is a little hard to understand, and it might benefit from review by a native English speaker.
R1 The paper has been revised by a native English speaker and minor revisions have been made throughout the manuscript (see underlined sentences in the revised version of the ms).

Q2. Secondly the figures did not appear well on the website so I was unable to adequately review them.
R2. Figures 1, 2, and 3 have been checked by authors and they seems to be ok for reviewing.

Q3. Thirdly the discussion is a little bit long and could be tightened.
R3. The discussion has been considerably shortened in the revised version of the manuscript.