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Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your decision letter and advice on our manuscript (Manuscript # 5263561611332937) entitled “Differential expression of ANXA1 in benign human gastrointestinal tissues and cancers”. We also thank the reviewer for the helpful comments and suggestions. Accordingly, we have revised the manuscript. All amendments are highlighted in yellow in the revised manuscript. In addition, point-by-point responses to the comments are listed below this letter.

We hope that the revision is acceptable for the publication in your journal.

Look forward to hearing from you soon.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

Guanzhen Yu
Point by point Response

General Responses

We thank Editors and Reviewers for their thorough review again. We hope we have adequately and carefully answered all the questions.

Responses to the Editors

“Ethics - We note that you used RNA from human tissue obtained from Shanghai Hospital. Experimental research that is reported in the manuscript must have been performed with the approval of an appropriate ethics committee. Research carried out on humans must be in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration (http://www.wma.net/e/policy/b3.htm), and any experimental research on animals must follow internationally recognized guidelines. A statement to this effect must appear in the Methods section of the manuscript, including the name of the body which gave approval, with a reference number where appropriate. “

Answer: We stated the approval of an appropriate ethics committee in the Methods section of the manuscript.

Responses to REFEREE #1

# 1. Figure 1A and figure 3A: Please label the Y axis.

Answer: Thanks. We have labeled the Y axis.

# 2. The authors claimed they used CCK8 assay for proliferation assessment in Methods section (page 7, paragraph 3) while in figure legends, they claimed MTT assay instead. Please correct it.

Answer: Sorry for the mistake. We have already corrected it in the Figure Legends.

# 3. Figure 4D, Figure 5 C and D: As the labels of Y axis, how is the “cell viability” or “proliferation rate” is defined? If cell proliferation was assessed using CCK8 assay (as the authors claimed), the y axis should be the unit of absorbance or normalized viable cell counts as the alias at different time points? Using “cell viability” or especially “proliferation rate” is inappropriate here, which misleadingly suggest the proliferation rate is changing at different time points? On the other hand, I have no
problem for the authors using “cell viability” at Figure 6A and 6C since it is “the ratio of viable cells at 48 h compared to that at 0 h” and truly reflected the proliferation capacity of the cells under different conditions.

Answer: That is a wonderful question I have noticed it before. Thanks. The labels of Y axis Figure 4D, Figure 5 C and D should be “Corrected absorbance (570nm)”.