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Author's response to reviews: see over
Dear Reviewer and Editors,

Enclosed please find the revised version of our manuscript “The NF-κB inhibitor celastrol could enhance the anti-cancer effect of gambogic acid on oral squamous carcinoma” by Dr. He, et al. We are so pleasure for those considerable and valuable suggestions from reviewers and editors.

Accordingly, in the revised version, we have asked the professional editor, Dr. H. Keaton, from American Journal Experts to edit our manuscript. All of the problems and mistakes have been corrected in the revised version. Figure 4 was modified and the term becomes clear. We have also explained why frames c and e seem similar in the letter.

A point -by -point response was attached and marked the revised contents with underline in the re-submitted manuscript.

We do appreciate editors and reviewers to pay more attention to judge our manuscript and provide so many valuable suggestions. We do hope that the interesting story will be published soon.

Best regards,

Corresponding author, Wantao Chen
Professor and Vice Chairman, Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery
Ninth People’s Hospital, School of Stomatology
Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine
639, Zhizaoju Road, Shanghai
P.R. China
Tel:86-21-63138341-5211
Fax:86-21-63135412
E-mail: chenwantao2002@hotmail.com
A point-by-point responses to the editor:
The responses were attached and the revised contents were marked with underline in the re-submitted manuscript.

1. Term "inhibition rate" in figure 4 is not clear.

As the revised version showed, Figure 4 was modified and the term becomes clear.

2. However in figure 5b, frames c and e seem very similar, ie in this experiment GA does not induce nuclear translocation of p65. please explain.

In our study, the results revealed that just part of the cells treated with GA generated nuclear translocation of p65. So in figure 5b, frames c and e seemed similar. In fact, part of the cells in frames c and e are difference. The difference was also proved by the cells with arrow in frames d and f. GA-induced NF-kappa B activity or nuclear translocation of p65 was further confirmed by EMSA in figure 5c.
In the revised version, we marked the nuclear translocation cells (which have two colours: blue and green) with arrows in frames d of figure 5b.

3. the statement "Chemotherapy (pre- or post-surgery) appears to be beneficial for local control and survival improvement." is, as far as I am aware, wrong. The authors acknowledge this in their response to comments, but have not corrected the manuscript.

We are so sorry for forgetting to correct the place in the manuscript. In the revised version, the statement has been replaced with “Chemotherapy (pre- or
post-surgery) does not appear to be beneficial for local control and survival improvement in the patients with OSCC”.

4. the english remains extremely poor. Professional editing is required. There are innumerable problems and mistakes, I list two examples.

"In spite of this, treatment with current chemotherapeutic drugs does not always induce a positive response. To overcome such a severe problem, multiple chemotherapeutic agents with different modes of action, used either alone or in combination, have been suggested[2]."
could be rephrased "current chemotherapeutic agents have limited efficacy in OSCC"
"GA, a novel compound isolated from Gamboges, has recently gained more and more attention as a major component of gamboges," needs to be rephrased. the authors could also provide some background as to what "Gamboges" are - I presume a plant, but further explanation would be helpful.

According to reviewer’s suggestion, in the revised version, we have asked the professional editor again, from American Journal Experts to edit our manuscript. All of the problems and mistakes have been corrected in the revised version.