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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have done an outstanding job at responding to my criticisms. The following further minor changes are strongly recommended:

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"

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."
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