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Reviewer’s report:

The authors have addressed most of my comments. A few points however have not yet been addressed satisfactorily:

In Fig. 2 and 3, the y-axis label ‘protein production’ was not changed to ‘protein activation’ or ‘protein phosphorylation’

If the authors had checked for the effect of DMSO on their cells previously (without including a solvent control in the experiments shown in the manuscript), they should mention this in the methods section.

The authors explanation for using Picettanol is vague, and their answer provided by the authors to the reviewer, who requested a comparison of Picettanol treatment with an alternative (more specific) Syk inhibitor, is insufficient.

The source of the THCE cells needs to be stated in the manuscript, not just mentioned in the rebuttal letter.

Level of interest: An article of importance in its field

Quality of written English: Acceptable
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