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Reviewer's report:

Chen and colleagues provide a revised manuscript that addresses most of my concerns. It is disappointing though that a large proportion of these answers is not included in the revised version of the manuscript but only written out in the comments. Overall the manuscript is improved although some of the figures are still of low quality and hard (impossible) to read.

The numbers below refers to my original comments.

1. The numbers of fresh-frozen/paraffin are still missing from the manuscript. And perhaps my initial question was not completely clear, but I would like to see all these questions answered in the manuscript and an analysis (like in table 2) of whether or not this affects REG4 expression.

2. OK.

3. I find no description of this in the manuscript and I think this is important information to convey to the readers. This should be mentioned and the detailed results could be given in supplementary.

4. OK.

5. Again, this should be clearly written out in the manuscript (e.g. in section 2.12).

6-8. OK.

9. If you really mean that the REG-4 expression stratification in figure 6 D/E was done taking “Age, Pathological classification, FIGO staging, Differentiation and Ki-67 expression” into account. Please specify this in the figure legend or in the methods section.

10-12. OK.

13. Overall, the texts (e.g. axis labels etc) are still blurry and very hard to make out unless the figure is really big. The legend in figure 2 (example: upper right in panel 1, above G1:63.06%) is still impossible to read regardless of magnification. If this information is not needed, please remove from the panels.

14-15. OK.

16. The reference was intended to help you strengthen your arguments on REG4
expression in cancers. As you only copied my informative text on it, the formatting (e.g. REG-4 vs REG4) and wording doesn’t follow the flow of your writing. Please rephrase into something like “and in hepatocellular carcinoma cell lines by stimulation with TGFb” or something along those lines. Or remove the reference/sentence if you don’t feel that it contribute to your argumentation.

17-21. OK.
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