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1. Response to reviewer comment/major compulsory revision from referee number 2.

Author’s response:

1. The loading control for western blot on the new figure 2 was added in the figure as requested. Please see page 16, Figure 2B.

2. We have also added the relative comment regarding loading controls on the figure 2 legend, please see page 17 on the yellow highlighted film.

3. The densitometry has already been calculated relatively to the loading control in the results shown, the reason we didn’t comment on it is because it is standard procedure in such measurements, however we now rectified this, in the relevant section for densitometry measurements in the materials and methods section we specifically point out that this has been done. Please see page 8 on the yellow highlighted film.

2. Response to Editorial comments:

a) More context was added in the relevant background section as requested to make more clear that we wanted to investigate the marker in more models in order to better describe it and it features please look at page 2 at yellow highlighted line.

b) Ethics are stated in page 5. Experiments were performed according to European standard for good clinical practice, approval number: 2008/561-1450
c) Relevant section for conflict of interest was added in page 3 (yellow highlighted line), also authors contributions was added in page 14, following the format given by you, in the same page the funding source of the study was described as requested. Additions are highlighted with yellow line in page 14.