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Reviewer: Katsumi Imaida
Reviewer's report:
General
Any treatment during the experiment should be described in detail in Materials and Methods. In your 'answers respond to reviewers' regarding inflammatory changes, authors described that "... after instillation we usually gave rats streptomycin 250mg/kg body weight and penicillin 100000 U/kg body weight by muscle injection for 7 days to decrease the infection." NNK/MCA treatment was only once by intratracheal instillation. However the 7 times injections of antibiotics were very important treatment for the rats in terms of inflammation process. Authors did not describe these important treatments in the manuscript, even in the revised manuscript. Again, any treatment during the experiment should be described in detail.

The method of intratracheal instillation was established 20 years ago, it did not change too much including using antibiotics from then on. Reference 12 was the most important paper describing the details of this method, so we ignore the detail. We were so sorry to bring the reviewer some troubles in reviewing the paper. We had added it in Materials and Methods.

What next?: Reject because scientifically unsound
Level of interest: An article of limited interest
Quality of written English: Acceptable
Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests: I declare that I have no competing interests.
Reviewer’s report
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Version: 2 Date: 14 November 2006
Reviewer: Myung-Haing CHO

Reviewer's report:
The authors’ cover letter indicated that the aim of current work is to declare whether aspirin and/or PEITC have effects in early stage of tumor progression. However, conclusion of their manuscript said that a single dose of 25 mg/kg body weight NNK is sufficient to induce preneoplastic lesions in Wistar rats by tracheal instillation and COX-2 plays an important role in both MCA and NNK induced tumorigenesis (please look at the conclusion part of revised manuscript). In the cover letter, the authors insisted that chemoprevention should be used in the early stage of tumorigenesis. I do agree with authors' cover letter. Authors also indicated that their aim is to declare whether aspirin, PEITC have anti-progression effects. However, their conclusion dose not contain such important information. They insisted that COX-2 plays an important role in tumor genesis, however, such observation is found elsewhere. This is why this reviewer suggested that current manuscript does not contain new information. I, therefore, strongly suggest that authors should wrap this manuscript in somewhat different way. That is to say, please do take advantage of what authors insisted in cover letter in main text, thus, please let the readers have get the benefits.

We have rewritten the manuscript, and try our best to make the points out, and thank for the very constructive suggestions of reviewer.

In summary, I do appreciate authors extensive works and am very impressed the amount of efforts and works done. However, conclusion of current manuscript is not well matched with the purpose of the study.