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Author's response to reviews:

We thank the reviewers for their helpful comments and we hope the manuscript is now acceptable for publication.

Response to all reviewers:

We inadvertently left out figure 4B and referred to it as 2B in the text. This has been rectified and we apologize for the confusion.

Reviewer David Y. Zhang

1. References were added as suggested
2. Page 9, line 14 - the verbiage was changed to clarify the time frame.
3. \((p<.05; n=5)\) was deleted. This was left there in error.
4. The line should have read figure 4B. This was corrected.
5. We cannot explain why there is a drop in the ethanol-treated cells (compared to untreated control) at days 7.5 or 10 following treatment. This only appeared to occur in the cells from the recurrent tumor, and it disappears by day 15. Even with this drop there is still a substantial difference between the control cells and the treated cells. A comment to this effect has been added to the manuscript.
6. In one assay we were looking for changes in the growth rate, in the other we were looking for cytotoxicity. This explanation had been added to the manuscript.
7. In figure 5 we used trypan blue exclusion instead of the Alamar blue metabolic assay because we were experiencing difficulty with our microtiter plate reader and there was no other reader available. We have frequently done trypan blue exclusion assays in concert with Alamar blue and there is no significance difference in the results.
8. Figure legend 6 has been re-written.

Reviewer Franky Chan:

Comments 1 and 2. This has been corrected (see comment to all reviewers).

Reviewer Mallikarjuna Gu

It is difficult to directly respond to this reviewer as the comments provided regard writing style more than substantive scientific criticism. Specific examples of places requiring language corrections would have been helpful.

We have edited the manuscript in response to the reviewer's comments and we have enlisted the aid of a college English teacher as an editorial assistant to ensure that any grammatical issues have been corrected.