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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editors:

Thank you for your response and the reviewer’s comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Rapamycin Prevents Retinal Neovascularization by Downregulation of Cyclin D1 in an Oxygen-Induced Retinopathy Model” (BOPH-D-19-00251R1). The comments were all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript, as well as providing significant guidance to our research. We have studied the comments carefully and have made several corrections which we hope will meet with the reviewer’s requirements for approving our manuscript. Revised portions are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the manuscript and the responses to the reviewer’s comments are as follows:

Editor Comments:

The quality of the English used throughout your manuscript does not currently meet our requirements, as there are several incorrect sentence constructions and grammatical errors throughout obscuring the message the authors want to convey. We recommend that you ask a native English speaking colleague to help you copy-edit the paper. If this is not possible, you may need to use a professional language editing service. Use of an editing service is neither a requirement nor a guarantee of acceptance for publication.

Response: We are very sorry for our unclear and vague writing in the paper. We have this manuscript been reviewed by someone who is a native English speaking colleague and made required corrections to the manuscript.
ELENA Pacella, Ph.D. (Reviewer 2):

Concern 1. Please include all comments for the authors in this box rather than uploading your report as an attachment. Please only upload as attachments annotated versions of manuscripts, graphs, supporting materials or other aspects of your report which cannot be included in a text format. Please overwrite this text when adding your comments to the authors.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. And we have written all comments in the box and uploaded the materials as attachments which cannot be included in a text format.

Reviewer 2 (Reviewer 3): PEER REVIEWER ASSESSMENTS

Based on the previous reviewers’ comment the authors have mentioned that they did not notice any side effects in the mice. (i) They need to clearly explain what parameters have been assessed to show that there are no side effects of the drug.

Response: We appreciate the reviewer’s favorable comments. Body weight is a very important parameter to assess the side effects of a drug. Body weight of mice was comparable in three groups at baseline on P7, and there was no significant difference in body weight among the three groups on P17 when experiments were performed.

Original: No side effects were observed in mice given RAPA.

Revised: Mice in the three groups all got weight (P17) and there was no significant difference in mean body weight among three groups, indicating that no obvious systemic side effect was associated with RAPA treatment (Appendix Fig. 4). (page 5) (Revised).

Appendix fig 4. Legend

Appendix Fig 4. Comparison of body weight in CON group, OIR group and RAPA group, respectively.

There was no significant difference body weight among CON group, OIR group and RAPA group on postnatal day 7(P7) (F=0.105, p=0.901). There was no significant difference body weight among CON group, OIR group and RAPA group on P17 (F=1.062, p=0.355).

Concern 2. (ii) A lot of mistakes in language, for example, fig.1 legend shows perfused well vessels instead of well-perfused vessels. Euthansian is used instead of euthanasia, intraperitoneally injection instead of intraperitonial.
Reponses: We appreciate your suggestions, and we are very sorry for our uncorrected writing in the paper. We have this manuscript been reviewed by someone who is a native English speaking colleague and made required corrections to the manuscript.