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Author's response to reviews: see over
RESPONSE TO THE COMMENTS.

1. To reviewer Associate Editor:

Associate Editor comments:

1) The authors have partly responded to the last round of reviewers' comments, but raised a more serious concern by the first reviewer. "The authors must explain why the incubation was changed to be 48 h and still get the results in the same Figure as at 24h of incubation." The authors need to provide a valid explanation for the concern from the first reviewer.

Response: Thank you for your suggestions. We will provide valid explanation to the first reviewer in the following point-by-point responses.

2) In addition, English in the manuscript also needs further improvement. I am unable to decide whether the manuscript is acceptable at present form.

Response: The revised manuscript has been edited and proofread by a medical editing company in China. Also, we do appreciate for your help to correct the idiomatic English expressions in our manuscript.

2. To reviewer Bungorn Sripaframeworks

Reviewer's report:

1) The authors did revise the manuscript with an addition of the similar cytotoxicity results on MEC1 cells. This should add more details on the discussion that why only Mc3 cells were selected for the further study.

Response: Our original intention was to investigate the mechanisms of proliferation inhibition of Ardipusilloside I on Mc3 cells, which is a highly metastatic cell line selected by repeated in situ-transplants of MEC-1 cells into salivary gland of nude mice and obtained from lung metastatic nodes(Wu JZ, Si-Tu ZQ, Liu ZB, et al. Selection and characterization of a high metastatic cell clone from mucoepidermoid carcinoma cell line MEC1 derived from human salivary gland. J Fourth Mil Med

...
Univ 1998;19(1):1–4. Article in Chinese). In the second round review, we were asked by the associate editor to test the proliferation inhibition on another cell line with the same kind of cancer. Because the revise time is limited, we only added the cytotoxicity results on MEC1 cells but without further study.

2) I still see the mistakes on the incubation time of Fig 5,6 (which are 24 h), I am skeptical on the response whether it is true as the authors explained or else?

Response: I was very sorry for my negligent attention to the revised manuscript, which even cause your suspicion on my response. Last month, I was so busy preparing and revising my doctoral dissertation that paying less attention to the revised manuscript. I have corrected the mistakes you pointed out in your comment and rechecked the manuscript. However, we was neglect to recheck the figure legends parts. Apologize again here. I must say that this manuscript is an important part of my doctoral dissertation. I do appreciate for your critical reading and constructive suggestions.

3) The authors must check on the language such as:
1. Abstract: line 20 "...can be a new active substances..."

Response: It was corrected to be "...could be a new active substances..."

2. Background: last paragraph should be re-written

Response: It has been re-written

3. Results:
3.1 cite the Figure in the text (p10 cite Fig 3a, 3b, 3c,3d, 4c; p11 cite Fig6c)

Response: All the errors were corrected following the suggestion

3.2 spelling of "underlying/underlineing" (p12, 13)

Response: It was " underlying ", which means " potential ">

4. Figure legend: 4.1 Fig3, what is honey in Fig 3c? explain Fig 3d

Response: " honey" is an typo error. It was corrected into Ardipusilloside I
And we have explain the Fig 3d in R3 version.

4.2 Fig 4, since all Figa,b,c,d were resulted of Hoechst 33342 staining, it is no
need to have "...incubated with.....only in Fig4b

Response: Thanks for your suggestions.

4.3 Fig5 , 6 should be 48 h and explain Fig 6c

Response: Thanks for your corrections.