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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear editors and reviewers:

All authors and I would like to say thanks to editors and two reviewers for reviewing this manuscript and giving constructive suggestions. We think the comments are very helpful for making the manuscript a better paper for publication in *BMC Cancer*. We have given a thoughtful consideration to all the comments and modified the paper and answered the questions carefully according to the suggestion of reviewers.

**Comment 1**

**Major Compulsory Revisions** (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. This study lack a proper antigen binding activity of polyclonal antibody produced, thus, authors need to show the detection ability of exogenous or endogenous antigen by the RPL15 antibody.

   **Authors:** Because of lackness of exogenous or endogenous antigen RPL15, we could not directly detect the antigen binding activity of produced antibody. However, the antibody was believed to be specific to RPL15 because of two reasons: 1) The size of the immunoblot band is about 25 kDa, which is similar to the expected Mr of RPL15 (24 kDa); 2) The signals of immunohistochemistry and immunoblot were greatly reduced when blocking with antigen peptide RVRCWQYRQLSALHR of RPL15.

**Minor Essential Revisions** (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

In discussion on line 14, Results of real time RT-PCR showed that-- (ref. 16)

   This is wrong understanding

   **Authors:** The article has been checked again for language errors. This sentence in Discussion on line 14 was corrected according to the suggestion of reviewer.

---

**Comment 2**

1. Since this work was based on the previous microassay study, which is not published, the authors should include the data in this paper not only to make a clearer story, but also to avoid a conflict situation that may occur.

   **Authors:** The microarray data showed that the expression levels of RPL15 in two gastric cancer tissues increased respectively 2.4- and 3.7-fold compared to those of their corresponding controls, which was mentioned in Introduction according to the suggestion of reviewer.

2. It is unclear how many bands were seen in the immunoblots using a polyclonal antibody in this work! If there is more than one band after immuno-reaction in the blots, then how do they distinguish specific and non-specific staining in tissue sections? This should be verified.

   **Authors:** Only one band could be often found in the immunoblots if exposure time of film
to ECL was controlled under 2 minutes. We believe that the antibody is specific to RPL15 because of two reasons: 1) The size of the immunoblot band is about 25 kDa, which is similar to the expected Mr of RPL15 (24 kDa); 2) The signals of immunohistochemistry and immunoblot were greatly reduced when blocking with antigen peptide RVRCWQYRQLSALHR of RPL15.

3 There are numerous genes overexpressed in human gastric carcinomas. Therefore, RPL15 could not be a potential marker for diagnosis of the cancer (p.14) if it can not be identified as a unique or specific gene to other cancers. Rather, it could be a potential therapeutic target as siRNA could suppress the growth of tumors in vivo as described in this work.

Authors: The sentence “RPL15 could not be a potential marker for diagnosis of the cancer” was deleted according to the suggestion of reviewer.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)
4 P.5, RPL15 antibody was raised by BBC, China (line 8), then why is listed as from Santa Cruz (line 14)?
5 Several typo or downloading errors: p. 7, 1x103 should be 1x103, and p.8, p.9, etc.
6 In the figure legend: Fig.1, ga1stric should be gastric.
 Fig. 2, why RhoA? It should be RPL15.
 Fig. 4, the “left panel” should be right panel for the histogram.
 Fig. 5, add markers on the tumors at the left panel.
Authors: The article has been checked again for language errors. All the minor errors were corrected according to the suggestion of reviewer.

If you have any further questions, please don't hesitate to ask me. Thank you again. We are looking forward to your reply.

Best regards,

Ling Wang
Department of Vascular and Endocrine Surgery,
Xijing Hospital, the Fourth Military Medical University,
17 Changle Western Road,
Xi’an, 710032, Shaanxi Province, P.R.China.
Phone: 0086-29-84775267;
Fax: 0086-29-84775267;
E-mail: wang-ling2006@163.com