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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your thoughtful review of our manuscript BCAR-D-19-00947R2. The manuscript requires minor revision before it can be considered further for publication. As recommended, we have used colored font to indicate changes in the revised manuscript. We hope it now meets your approval.

Our response to the comments is listed below:

Reviewer 1

The authors have carefully addressed the comments and made necessary corrections. I do not have further comments.

Reply: Thank you for your thoughtful review of our manuscript.
Reviewer 2

Q1. I suggest the authors submit the present manuscript for English Language proofreading for improvement.

Reply: Thank you. The comments above are worthy of careful consideration. The manuscript has been edited for proofreading to confirm that standard grammar and usage are achieved.

Q2. In the first paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence on lines 52-53 should be cited. The last paragraph still does not read well.

Reply: Thank you for your thoughtful review of our manuscript. As recommended, we have supplemented the references in the section. Furthermore, we revised the last paragraph of the Introduction in our manuscript.


Q3. In the Methods, lines 89-91, the authors should consider citing an appropriate reference with detailed protocol on the confirmation of DCM. The detail described is not sufficient.

Reply: Thank you. In our previous study, the animal model was established in BALB/c mice by immunization with porcine cardiac myosin to induce DCM. As previously reported [12], we confirmed myosin-induced DCM model by histomorphological study and echocardiographic assessments in the study. As recommended, we have supplemented the reference in our revised manuscript.


Q4. In the Histopathology section, I am still worried that using only five random fields of view for quantifying fibrosis may not be enough. The argument put forward is not convincing.
Reply: Thank you for your thoughtful review of our manuscript. In our present study, 5 random fields of view per mouse (n=8) were evaluated for CVF analysis across the left ventricular section. Consequently, there were $8 \times 5 = 40$ quantitative data for statistical analysis in each group. We clarified the issue with my co-authors and statisticians according to the comments.

Reviewer 3

Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format.

Reply: Thank you for your thoughtful review of our manuscript. As recommended, we have used colored font to indicate changes in the revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Bang-Wei Wu

Department of Cardiology, Huashan Hospital, Fudan University