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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Here is our manuscript entitled "Gm40600 suppressed SP 2/0 isograft tumor by reducing Blimp1 and Xbp1 proteins" (BCAN-D-18-02459R3).

Thank you very much for your reviewed opportunity of the paper. We are very appreciated your experts’ suggestions and comments.

According to your suggestions and comments, now we have edited the text and have the entire text edited by a native English speaker to correct the many problems of language usage. Our manuscript has been revised according to your style.

Now, we have completely revised the paper and are sending our revised paper to you. We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you very much for your work!

The following is our response to the issues raised by reviewers, point by point.
Editor Comments:

1 - Any manuscript submitted to a BioMed Central journal must be original and the manuscript, or substantial parts of it, must not be under consideration by any other journal. We note that the current submission contains textual overlap with other previously published works. Please rewrite these sentences and phrases in your own words to ensure no overlap. If there is overlap in the Methods section, please ensure that you summarize the methods and cite the source.

There is considerable overlap with:


and some overlap with other publications.

We recommend the authors use an anti-plagiarism software, such as turnitin or other freely available ones, to access the overlap, and reduce it.

While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot ignore the use of text from previously published work.

Author response:

The two papers (https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10428194.2019.1590572?journalCode=ilal20, and https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s12935-018-0635-7) are our previous researches. They are similar to this manuscript in the experimental methods and design. In addition, we are not native English speakers. These causes some overlap with previous publications.

We understand that any manuscript submitted to a BioMed Central journal must be original and the manuscript, or substantial parts of it, must not be under consideration by any other journal.

According to your suggestions, we try our best to reduce some overlap with other publications again (Please see the revised manuscript).

2 - Please revise your ‘Declaration’ section to be in the following order with these headings:

- Declarations
  - Ethics approval and consent to participate
- Consent for publication
- Availability of data and materials
- Competing interests
- Funding
- Authors' Contributions
- Acknowledgements
- Authors' Information (optional)

Author response:

According to your suggestions, we have done this. (Please see Declarations section, lines 1-60, pages 16 and 17).

3 - Please revise the Declarations subsection - Ethics approval and consent to participate - of your manuscript to include the full names of the ethics committees that approved your study and the reference numbers where appropriate.

Author response:

According to your suggestions, we have done this. (Please see Declarations section, lines 6-12, page 16).

4 - The 'Consent for publication' section covers manuscripts that contain any individual person’s data in any form (including individual details, images or videos), for which consent to publish must be obtained from that person, or in the case of children, their parent or legal guardian. If your manuscript does not contain any individual person’s data, please state “Not applicable” in this section.

Author response:

According to your suggestions, we have done this. (Please see Declarations section, lines 14-18, page 16).

5 - Please use (unique) initials only rather than family names in the Authors' contributions section.

Author response:
According to your suggestions, we have done this. (Please see Declarations section, lines 50-60, page 16).

6 - At this stage, please upload your proofread manuscript as a single, final, clean version that does not contain any tracked changes, comments, highlights, strikethrough or text in different colours. All relevant tables and figures should also be clean versions. Figures (and additional files) should remain uploaded as separate files. Should you wish to respond to these revision requests, please include the information in the designated input box only.

Author response:

According to your suggestions, we have done these.

BMC Cancer operates a policy of open peer review, which means that you will be able to see the names of the reviewers who provided the reports via the online peer review system. We encourage you to also view the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, to see the names of the reviewers.

Author response:

Thanks for your suggestions. I have viewed the reports there, via the action links on the left-hand side of the page, and seen the names of the reviewers.

Reviewer reports:

Richard E. Davis (Reviewer 2): The authors have done an outstanding job at responding to my criticisms. The following further minor changes are strongly recommended:

Author response:

Thanks for reviewer’s encouraging comments and suggestions for our study.

1) There are still a few errors in the English:

"Accordantly" should be replaced with "Accordingly"

"T PI staining" in line 53 should simply be "PI staining"

Author response:

Thanks for pointing out these mistakes.
According to your suggestions, "Accordantly" has been replaced with "Accordingly". (Please see Discussion section, line 31, page 10).

"T PI staining" has been depleted. (Please see Results section, line 45, page 8).

2) Since a human homolog for Gm40600 has not been identified, if indeed there is one, the final sentence of the Abstract is misleading: "Thus, regulation of Gm40600 expression may be a potential therapeutic approach for treating MM." Similar sentences are present at the end of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 of the Discussion, and at the end of the Conclusions. Not all of these sentences are necessary, because the conclusion should be obvious to the reader. However, where this point is made, it should be modified because there is no known human homolog, and because the therapeutic route to inducing expression of a non-expressed gene is not obvious. Specifically, the sentence at the end of the Abstract should be modified to something like "Regulation of a human homolog of Gm40600, or associated factors, may be a potential therapeutic approach for treating MM."

Author response:

Thanks for pointing out these questions.

According to your suggestions, the sentence at the end of the Abstract should be modified as followed: "Thus, regulation of a human homolog of Gm40600, or associated factors, may be a potential therapeutic approach for treating MM." (Please see Abstract section, lines 15-18, page 3).

The sentence “Thus, regulating Gm40600 expression may represent a novel therapeutic strategy for treating MM.” has been edited as followed “Thus, it is worth to identify a human homolog for Gm40600 and explore the role of a human homolog of Gm40600 in MM development.” (Please see Discussion section, lines 17-23, page 12).

The sentence “Thus, Gm40600 overexpression may be a promising strategy for treating MM.” has been depleted. (Please see Discussion section, lines 39-40, page 12).

The sentence “suggesting that regulation of Gm40600 may effectively suppress survival of MM PC” has been depleted. (Please see Discussion section, lines 53-54, page 12).

The sentence “Thus, Gm40600 overexpression may be a very effective way of promoting MM PC apoptosis by reducing Blimp1 expression.” has been edited as followed “Thus, Gm40600 overexpression promoted SP 2/0 cell apoptosis by reducing Blimp1 expression.” (Please see Discussion section, lines 34-38, page 13).

The sentence “Thus, Gm40600 overexpression may be a potential way of reducing malignant proliferation of PC and antibody production involved in MM.” has been depleted. (Please see Discussion section, lines 50-51, page 13).
The sentence “Thus, regulation of Gm40600 expression may represent a novel therapeutic strategy for treating MM.” has been edited as followed “Thus, it is necessary to explore the role of a human homolog of Gm40600 in MM. This will guarantee that regulation of a human homolog of Gm40600, or associated factors, may represent a novel therapeutic strategy for treating MM.” (Please see Discussion section, lines 25-34, page 14).