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Reviewer’s report:

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?

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.

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.

Conclusion

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

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.
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