Author's response to reviews

Title: Phenotype, donor age and gender affect function of human bone marrow-derived Mesenchymal Stromal Cells

Authors:

Georg Siegel (georg.siegel@med.uni-tuebingen.de)
Torsten Kluba (torsten.kluba@med.uni-tuebingen.de)
Ursula Hermanutz-Klein (ursula.hermanutz-klein@med.uni-tuebingen.de)
Karen Bieback (karen.bieback@medma.uni-heidelberg.de)
Hinnak Northoff (hinnak.northoff@med.uni-tuebingen.de)
Richard Schaefer (rsmd@stanford.edu)

Version: 7 Date: 15 May 2013

Author's response to reviews:

Dear Dr. Lee,

On behalf of my co-authors I would like to thank you and Dr. Phinney for your kind willingness to re-review the revised version and for your most valuable suggestions.

We made all editorial changes as requested (the changes can be identified by the “track changes” modus in Word), and we were able to reduce the Discussion section from 2,299 words to 1,793 words (reduction of 22%).

Thank you again for considering our manuscript for publication in BMC MEDICINE.

POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE to re-review

Reviewer: Donald Phinney

The authors have addressed in a comprehensive manner all criticisms raised during the initial review of the manuscript. Therefore, no additional revisions to the experimental results are required. However, it is the opinion of this reviewer that the Discussion section of the manuscript is extremely verbose. In many cases it reiterates much of the information contained within the Results section of the paper - the description of the surface phenotype analysis encompasses an entire page - and other sections read like a review. I appreciate that the authors expanded the section to better justify their approach. However, it is highly recommended that the authors reduce the length of the Discussion to improve readability and content, e.g. state the implications of the findings and how they advance the field or challenge existing data.

Authors’ Response:
- We thank for the valuable suggestions.

We reduced the Discussion section about 22% and emphasized the clinical implications of our study in the Conclusions section.