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Reviewer’s report:

The authors did not answer the question whether Thymosin treatment increased the e-cadherin levels above "sham"

Tautological sentences like that in the Background, end of paragraph 1 should be removed.

The authors use reference 14 to justify the statement that UUO is regarded as the best animal model of progressive tubulointerstitial fibrosis; reference 14 does not make this claim or even imply it.

I can not see any indication of the species of the cells used in the in vitro experiments or whether they are transformed or primary.

Have the authors demonstrated that beta actin is not altered by the treatments? If not then it is not an appropriate control.

The authors do not present any data showing cells treated with Thymosin beta 4 alone; they should do this as it appears from their data that it changes the cell phenotype.

The authors must address the clear discrepancy between alpha smooth muscle actin mRNA and protein.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes
Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? 
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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