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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Professor Peter Newmark:

Our manuscript number is MS 2645390346435566

Thank you for your kind comments concerning our revised manuscript (manuscript number: 2645390346435566) entitled “Combined immunohistochemistry of β-catenin, cytokeratin 7, and cytokeratin 20 is useful for the differential diagnosis of lung cancer” by Satoshi Ikeda, Masahiko Fujimori, Satoshi Shibata, Masazumi Okajima, Yasuyo Ishizaki, Takeshi Kurihara, Yoshihiro Miyata, Yosuke Shimizu, Noriaki Tokumoto and Toshimasa Asahara (we have further revised the title as “Combined immunohistochemistry of β-catenin, cytokeratin 7, and cytokeratin 20 is useful in discriminating primary lung adenocarcinomas from metastatic colorectal cancer”).

We appreciate your useful and favorable comments as well as those from the reviewers. We have further revised the manuscript thoroughly in accordance with the reviewer’s comments. Our responses to the reviewer’s comments and our revisions in the paper are described in the accompanying sheets.

We hope that our manuscript with further revision is now satisfactory for publication in “BMC Cancer.”

Sincerely yours,

Satoshi Ikeda, M.D., Ph.D.
Department of Surgery, Division of Frontier Medical Science, Programs for Biomedical Research, Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences, Hiroshima University, 1-2-3 Kasumi, Minami-ku, Hiroshima 734-8551, Japan and Department of Endoscopic Surgery and Surgical Science, Graduate School of Biomedical Science, Hiroshima University, 1-2-3 Kasumi, Minami-ku, Hiroshima 734-8551, Japan.
E-mail: sikeda@hiroshima-u.ac.jp, Tel: 81-82-257-5222, Fax: 81-82-257-5224
Responses to the reviewer’s comments:
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A major change has been made to the manuscript: the affiliations of two authors (Satoshi Ikeda and Masazumi Okajima) have been changed.

Reviewer Dr. Tibor Tot

Major Compulsory Revisions

(1) The reviewer requested that the authors should change the title of the manuscript.

In accordance with the reviewer’s comment, we have changed the title.

(2) (a) The reviewer pointed out the misusage of “differentiation”.

In accordance with the reviewer’s comment, we have replaced “differentiation” and “differential” with “discrimination” and “discriminating,” respectively, throughout the manuscript.

(b) The reviewer said that the authors should delete the explanations of the single needle biopsy in the Abstract section.

In accordance with the reviewer’s comment, we have deleted this information from the abstract section.

(3) The reviewer said that the reason why the authors selected limited samples for this study is still unclear.

In keeping with the expectations of any researcher, we had initially planned to examine all the samples. However, despite this intention, we were unable to use all the samples for various reasons (for example, we were unable to obtain paraffin-embedded tissues of several samples). In addition, 10 samples of primary colorectal cancer were selected because these 10 samples were obtained from primary colorectal sites that corresponded to the lung metastasis of the colorectal cancers examined in this study. We did not choose these samples in order to obtain advantageous results. In accordance with the reviewer’s comment, we have given a reason for not examining all the samples in the Methods section.

(4) The reviewer said that the authors should discuss pulmonary intestinal-type adenocarcinoma which is one of the lung adenocarcinomas and shows a similar CK phenotype to those of colorectal cancer.
We were unaware of the existence of the this type of pulmonary carcinoma (pulmonary intestinal-type adenocarcinoma that shows CK7+/CK20+) until the reviewer pointed it out. We believe that it is very important to discuss pulmonary intestinal-type adenocarcinoma in our manuscript. We have added this information and its reference to the Discussion section.

(5) The reviewer requested that a thorough language editing is still a must.

In accordance with the reviewer’s comment, our manuscript has been thoroughly checked once again by native English speakers.