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Dear Editors,

We have carefully revised the manuscript according to the requests of the reviewer, which were explained in detail in the following letter. The major changes in the revised version have been marked in red.

We hope that the revised version of our manuscript could now be reconsidered in your Journal. Particularly, we thank you and the reviewer for the helpful comments to improve the manuscript.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any other suggestions.

Many thanks and best wishes for your work.

Best Regards,

Xi-Chun Hu

Xichun Hu
Vice director
Department of Medical Oncology
Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center
No. 270, Dong An Road
Shanghai, China, 200032
E-mail: huxicun@gmail.com
Tel: (8621) 64175590-5906 or 13816110335 (mobile)
Fax: (8621) 54561523
Responses to reviewers:

Referee #3 Comments:

1. My main comment will be about the interpretation of in vivo experiment. The authors conclude the Feno “suppressed timor growth”, while looking at the graph Feno slowed down timor growth, but increasing cell death, but growth is still going up! Please relativize you interpretation.

We thank the Reviewer for the helpful comment and totally agree that “slow down” is more suitable for the interpretation of our in vivo experiment. Therefore, we replaced “suppressed” with “slowed down” in all the text and figure legends.

2. Figure 2 A and C as well as figure 3A should be completed by a bar graph with mean values and SD.

According to this helpful comment, we completed Figure 2 and Figure 3 by a bar graph with mean values ±SD. Please see for details in revised Figure 2 and Figure 3 with their corresponding legends. We also provided the mean values ±SD in the revised manuscript on pages 11 and 12, which were marked in red.

3. Please provide +/- SD for in vivo experiment

Following this helpful comment, we provided the data for in vivo experiment in the revised manuscript on pages 16 and 17, which were
marked in red.

4. As legend of the graph showing in vivo apoptosis represent a ratio, could you please change it for % of apoptotic cell

Thank you for your helpful comment. We changed “Positive apoptotic cell ratio” into “% of apoptotic cells” in Figure 6G.

5. Figure 6F still need magnification for the control.

According to the comment, we added magnification for the control in Figure 6F. Please see the revised Figure 6F.

6. As body weights did not change significantly, while tumor sizes did… is it possible that Feno increase mice global body weight?

We thank the Reviewer for the inspiring comments. We re-analyzed the data to see if there was any possibility that fenofibrate could increase global body weight, which was calculated from the mice body weight minus tumor weight. The global body weight was 20.9±1.2g for control group and 21.3±1.1g for fenofibrate group, p>0.05, indicating no significant association of global body weight of mice with fenofibrate treatment. The explanation might be that the tumor weight, which accounted for about merely 10% of body weight, was too small to affect the global body weight change.