Author's response to reviews

Title: Electroacupuncture improves cerebral blood flow and attenuates moderate ischemic injury via Angiotensin II and its receptors-mediated mechanism in rats

Authors:

Jing Li (jlipre@163.com)
Jiaojun He (jjhepre@163.com)
Jingjun Cui (jicuipre@163.com)
Ying Ma (ymapre@163.com)
Xuezhu Zhang (xzzhangpre@163.com)
Yuanhao Du (yhdupre@163.com)

Version: 3
Date: 11 August 2014

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

Thank you for your kind work on our manuscript entitled “Electroacupuncture improves cerebral blood flow and attenuates moderate ischemic injury via Angiotensin II and its receptors-mediated mechanism in rats”. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer: 1

Minor Essential Revisions

The authors have addressed majority of my concerns in the revised manuscript, and I think the study is suitable for publication, if the authors can make some minor edits on the manuscripts (listed below).

1. Method: Immunohistochemistry Assay. Authors compared the expressions of Ang II, AT1R, and AT2R before and after MCAO as determined by immunohistochemistry assay (IOD). Author should clarify immunohistochemistry assay in the method. Author need add the details and references. Add this sentences “The ROD was calculated according to the following equation: (OD of Ang II/ AT1R/ AT2R # OD of background)/OD of background as reported previously (Xiao, Jiang et al. 2013; Zhang, Xia et al. 2013)”. 
Response: Thank you for your comments and suggestions, we have added the sentences and references as you advised.

2. Method: Western blotting; authors mentioned “Gq proteins as described previously”. However there is no reference. Author need add the reference.

Response: Thanks, we have added the references.

3. Discussion: the 4th paragraph “According to the Nested design study on EA combined with our earlier research, stimulation parameters, with a stimulation rate of 15 Hz and an electrical current amplitude of 1mA for 20 minutes, was adopted in this study.” Is your earlier research published or not? Please add the reference.

Response: Thanks, we have added the references.

4. The letter “P” in “P<0.05” should be italic.

Response: We have made the corresponding revision, the letter “P” in “P<0.05” is italic.

5. Table 5, please clarify the meaning of “※p<0.05, ※※p<0.01 vs m”

Response: Thanks for your kind reminds, we sincerely say sorry for our mistake, and the corresponding information have been added as stated in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer: 2

1. I appreciate that the authors have put a lot of energy in improving the paper. In this revision the authors have adequately addressed almost concerns I raised before.

Response: Thanks for your kind comments on our work.
Reviewer: 3

In general, there are too many tables in this manuscript. They make the reader feel a little bit dizzy, why not use some bar graphs so that impress the reader?

Response: Indeed, bar graph is more impressive to the reader than table, and we have at first designed to use some bar graphs instead of tables. However, in view of the quality of figures after addition of standard bar and *(There are not enough space for us to add the “*”, “+” that derived from different comparisons, and even if they were added, some markers are too small to be clearly identified due to the large number of bars, the whole graphs are messy), we converted the data information of bar graphs to the corresponding Tables, and hope you will understand.

Abstract

“The enhanced expression of AT1R was partially inhibited by electroacupuncture, while AT2R level was significantly elevated.” this is an obscure statement upon the electroacupuncture effect on AT2R level.

“stimulation not only attenuated upregulated-expressions of Gq and CaM, but also shifted them to later time phases”. “shifted them to later time phases” is not a scientific expression and does not make sense to me.

Response: Thank you for your time and comments. We have made some revision, and hope it will meet with your approval.

Methods

Page 10 Western Blotting Cam or CaM? It should be keep consistency throughout the whole paper. The dilution of every antibody used should be mentioned, the similar
problem in the immunohistochemistry assay part.

**Response:** We are sincerely sorry for our mistake, we have made the corresponding revision, and the dilutions of antibodies used were added, as stated in the revised manuscript.

**Conclusion**

In general, it is too long which is not so concise.

**Response:** We have made some revision of our conclusion according to your suggestion, as stated in the revised manuscript.

**Tables**

Page 34 table 4 bottom “values were 0.55±0.07 for caM and …” the same thing of caM.

Page 35 table 5 bottom “…**p<0.01 vs m” what is the “m” on behalf of? Every abbreviation should be clarified.

**Response:** Thanks, we sincerely say sorry for our mistakes, and the corresponding revisions have been made.

Thank you and best regards.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Yuanhao Du,

yhdupre@163.com

Tianjin University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Tianjin, China