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Reviewer’s report:

General
This is a revised version of a previously submitted manuscript. While the conclusions remain potentially significant, the revisions were incredibly sloppy and the revised manuscript still does not meet the minimal requirements for publication. The following points highlight these concerns.

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)
1) Table 1: This Table remains unclear. What are the two sets of nucleotide sequences? What are “W” and “C” (could it be Watson and Crick, referring to the two strands)? There should be footnotes that explain these cryptic points to the reader.
2) Table 3: The heading “IC” was not defined.
3) Figure 1: While the authors have now added data from normal subjects, the data is not clearly labeled.
4) Figure 2A and 2B: Labeling for the time axis was added, but it appears to be wrong. If the time scale is really milliseconds, the experiments were only slightly more than one second long (total). This is not sufficient for the conclusions that were made.
5) Figure 2: First of all, the figures are STILL mislabeled even though this error was noted as being corrected. The figures DO NOT correspond to the text. The text refers to two figures, but there are three figures included. The fact that this is still wrong after pointing it out before is very annoying, and raises serious concerns about the overall quality and attention to detail of this study.
6) If we assume that Figures 2C, 2D and 3 correspond to 2C, 2D and 2E in the text, it is still difficult to interpret the immunodetection experiments and the text referring to it. Regrettably, there is also no description of the sample for each panel in the figure legend. Furthermore, the description in the text is confusing. From the text (top of page 10), it sounds like 2C and 2D should be negative for CFTR, while 2E should be positive. However, the figure looks like 2C is negative, while 2D and 2E are positive. Also, more general information should be provided. For example, are all the panels taken at the same magnification (it doesn’t look like it)? Have the antibodies used been published and validated (if so, why were no references given)? The confusion and lack of necessary basic information required to evaluate (or even understand) the figure is really bad. Overall, the confusion caused by this figure still makes it impossible to judge the overall claims of the manuscript.
7) Again on page 10, the paragraph “The R1162X patient ...” describes controls. If this data is not shown in a figure, it should be indicated as such. (ie, “data not shown”).

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

Which journal?: Appropriate or potentially appropriate for BMC Medicine: an article of importance in its field
What next?: Unable to decide on acceptance or rejection until the authors have responded to the major compulsory revisions
Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published
Statistical review: No
Declaration of competing interests:
Same as before