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Dear Editor,

Please find attached revised version of the manuscript (Manuscript ID: 6210245881282869) entitled “Cephalotaxus griffithii Hook.f. needle extract induces cell cycle arrest, apoptosis and suppression of hTERT and hTR expression on human breast cancer cells” with changes highlighted in yellow and a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments (below). Some of the reviewer’s comments are difficult to understand to respond appropriately. We are pleased that the reviewers agree that our study is interesting and worth publishing in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine.

We appreciate the comments from the reviewers. Thank you for reviewing our manuscript.

Sincerely,

Narayan Chandra Talukdar
Authors’ response to reviewers’ comments

Reviewer 1:

1. Reviewer’s comment:
   For Table 1 and Figure 1, an average of 3-treatments of A, B, C, were presented, respectively. However, the detailed labels for both Table 1 & Figure 1 should be showed within the Table and Figure. A conclusion sentence with detailed findings of Table 1 & Figure 1 should be presented in the article. The authors should move the Figure legends in page 22-23 to the results section. It may read as “For example, Table 1 demonstrated that, there were significant treatment differences observed among the average “life” of the extracts treatments on cancer cells, where the PE extracts showed the best treatment results in all three different cancer related cells in both average human cancer cell viability (Table 1; p<0.001) as well as in the comparisons of the 6 levels of viability measured by concentrations showed in Figure 1 (P<0.01). It showed PE extract inducted maximal death in ZR751 cells”

Author’s response:
We have now shown the detail labels within the Figure 1 and Table 1
As suggested a conclusion sentence has been added as “PE extract induced ...... cytotoxicity of PE extract towards breast cancer cells “.
 Please refer to Page no.: 10; Line no.: 237 and 238

As suggested that “The authors should move the Figure legends in page 22-23 to the results section. It may read as “For example, Table 1 demonstrated that, there were significant treatment differences observed among the average “life” of the extracts treatments on cancer cells, where the PE extracts showed the best treatment results in all three different cancer related cells in both average human cancer cell viability (Table 1; p<0.001) as well as in the comparisons of the 6 levels of viability measured by concentrations showed in Figure 1 (P<0.01). It showed PE extract inducted maximal death in ZR751 cells”, we have difficulty in understanding this suggestion to response appropriately.

2. Reviewer’s comment:
The review believes the Figure 2 A&B were not necessary to presented in the paper, since the comparisons between the 3 treatment in 3 cells have been presented in Table 1
& Figure 1—and Figures 2A & 2B just showed the best treatment results of PE extract in ZR751 cells. The Figure 2A & 2B did not present additional evidence to support the conclusions from Table 1 & Figure 1, no comparisons were made there. It is suggested to remove Figure 2 from the article.

Author’s response:
We disagree with the reviewer as Figure 2A and 2B presents results of experiments which were follow-up of the question that emerged from the results in Table 1 & Figure 1. PE extract induced cell death was highest among the CGN extracts, with maximum cancer cell death occurred in ZR751 cells (Table 1 and Figure 1); we carried out mechanism study of PE extract induced ZR751 cell death. PE extract induced ZR751 cell death was associated with apoptosis (Figure 2A and 2B).

3. Reviewer’s comment:
Page 11 & 22, the authors may re-write the findings of Figure 3 which make more clearly conclusion about the results of effects of PE extract on cell distribution in ZR751 cells.

Author’s response:
As suggested, we have rewritten the sentence to bring out the conclusion with clarity. The sentence was rewritten as “Overall, these results indicate that........... G_2 cell cycle arrest and subsequent apoptotic process”.
Please refer to Page no.: 11; Line no.: 258 and 260.
Overall, these results indicate that........... G_2 cell cycle arrest and subsequent apoptotic process.

4. Reviewer’s comment:
Page 23 & 11, like Figure 3, the writings for Figure 4 on pages 23 and 11 should be combined to clearly express the findings of Figure 4—i.e., “PE extract treatment causes a greater caspase-dependent apoptotic cell death in human breast cancer cells in both mean and caspase-3, -8 and -9 activity assay, respectively (p<.005). “

Author’s response:
We are sorry that we are unable to understand this suggestion to response appropriately.
5. **Reviewer’s comment:**
Is the story of P53 has been showed and discussed in Figure 4? The figure 5s, like Figure 2 may be eliminated—the author does not need to repeat the finding of a particular PE treatment of P53—it does not add learnings from previous companies by presenting one of the treatment effect.

**Author’s response:**
We believe that Figure 4 shows upregulation of p53 by PE extract and Figure 5 reinforce that the p53 is actually involved in PE extract induced human breast cancer cells death. We feel that Figure 5 should be an integral part of the manuscript.

6. **Reviewer’s comment:**
Pages 12, 13 & 23, 24, Similar to Figures 1&2, 4&5, the reviewer believes the authors should stay on focus to present the comparison results, not both comparison and its effects on unique phytochemicals.

**Author’s response:**
We are sorry that we are unable to understand this suggestion to response appropriately.
Reviewer 2:

Reviewer’s comment:
This is an important article in this field. Quality of written English, method, Statistics, result and discussion are all acceptable.

Author’s response:
The authors thank the reviewer for the valuable time given in reviewing the article.