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To the Assistant Editor of the
BMC Urology
Dr. Zhang

Aachen, 30th June 2019
Dear Dr. Zhang

Thank you for your – hopefully – last questions on our manuscript titled “Expression of components of the urothelial cholinergic system in bladder and cultivated primary urothelial cells of the pig”

Editor Comments:

1. Please address Reviewer#2’s comments as mentioned below.
GENERAL COMMENTS: The authors have indicated in the response letter that IHC on the additional targets requested is not possible at the present time due to technical issues (requirement to test and optimize human antibodies on porcine tissues).

REQUESTED REVISIONS:
I would request the authors to state in the manuscript explicitly why IHC validation of the additional targets was not performed (in addition, please also state which targets were attempted but not successful).

We have addressed this comment by including the text passage „So far, we have only established the M2 and M3 immunohistostaining for the targets also analysed via qRT-PCR. As it is not easy to find antibodies that are applicable for pig tissue, it is often necessary to use antibodies for human or other species and hope for cross-reactions. Therefore we also tried a GAPDH antibody which turned out to react very unspecific. As the use of immune staining is more for visual effects we postponed the establishment of other antibodies.” in the “Discussion” section, p. 10, l. 230-235.

2. Textual overlap

We note that the current submission contains some textual overlap with other previously published works, in particular:
https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs00384-017-2942-1

This overlap mainly exists in the Statistical analysis. Screenshot has been attached to further help your revisions.

While we understand that you may wish to express some of the same ideas contained in these publications, please be aware that we cannot condone the use of text from previously published work. Please re-phrase these sections to minimise overlap.

Concerning the textual overlap: Actually, I am not sure where you did find the marked passages from the mentioned paper in our text. I did run a search myself and cannot find any of the wording in our document. Neither did we have “patients” in our study or an “intention to treat”, nor did we perform a “Statistical analysis of lost patients”. We also did no “Monitoring” on the animals as we only used tissue and cells. To the statistical analysis: we did use Shapiro-Wilks test to test for normal distribution and One-Way ANOVA with Tukey-Post Hoc test. The paper you mentioned uses parametric Student’s T-test or parametric Mann-Whitney U test. Here also I did not find any of the overlap you mentioned.

3. Funding

Thank you for providing a funding section. Please state whether the funding body had any role in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation of data and in writing the manuscript in this section.

We added a passage in the "Funding” section at p. 16, l.345-346: The Dr. R. Pfleger GmbH had
no control over the study conduct, or the collection and analysis of the data.

4. Authors’ contributions

Please note that based on the current authors’ contributions section, US does not automatically qualify for authorship.
We ask that you ensure that author contributions are in line with the ICMJE guidelines (below), and that all listed authors have performed all four points specified below.

An 'author' is generally considered to be someone who has made substantive intellectual contributions to a published study. According to the ICMJE guidelines, to qualify as an author one should have performed all 4 of the following points:

A. Made substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data;

B. Been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content;

C. Given final approval of the version to be published. Each author should have participated sufficiently in the work to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content; and

D. Agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

Please provide more information on individual author contributions and ensure author contributions listed in the authors’ contribution section are reflective of ICMJE guidelines.
Please also ensure that all authors have read and approve of the final version and add a statement confirming this.

We changed the “Author’s contribution” section, p., l. as follows: “All authors have made substantial contributions to conception and design, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data: DL designed the study, performed the experiments and analysed the data, JK performed the experiments and analysed the data, RL and PA performed the experiments JG and JOG designed the study and analysed the data. US, as an employee of the sponsor, was involved in the determination of the study design, but had no control over the study conduct, or the collection and analysis of data. All authors have been involved in drafting the manuscript or revising it critically for important intellectual content;

All authors have given final approval of the version to be published and take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the content. All authors have agreed to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved. The authors have read and approve of the final version.”
5. Figure legends

Please place the figure caption(s)/title(s) as text within the manuscript file (usually after the references) under the heading ‘Figure legends’. These figures should still be submitted as separate figure file and should contain the image graphic (and any associated keys) only.

6. Please upload both manuscript with track changes and a clean copy when submitting your revision. Please remove the current ‘Answer to the reviewers comments R2.docx’ from the file inventory as it is no longer required at this stage.

Thank you for this friendly reminder. We will see to it, that your requirements are being followed.

Yours sincerely,
Dr. Joachim O. Grosse