Reviewer’s report

Title: A Plausible Role for Actin Gamma Smooth Muscle 2 (ACTG2) in Small Intestinal Neuroendocrine Tumorigenesis

Version: 2 Date: 02 Feb 2016

Reviewer: Malgorzata Wiench

Reviewer's report:

The authors have now responded to most of the comments and substantially improved the methods and results sections. However, a few issues should be clarified before the publication.

Re point 3 in the reply to Reviewer: Although the information about DZNep has been added there is still no manufacturer info for 5-aza-dC and EPZ-6438. Also, when the titration experiments were performed how was the output (here: non-toxicity) established? Was the cell viability assessed?

Re point 4 in the reply to Reviewer: It is still not clear which vectors exactly were used for both ACTG expression and control. The authors now state the ACTG expression vector was purchased from Origene Technologies Cat nr RC203151. According to the website the vector is pCMV6-Entry. Did the authors request the pcDNA3.1 instead to match it with the control? If not it means that pCMV6-Entry has been used as an expression vector and pcDNA3.1 as a control vector. This should be stated very clearly.

Re point 9 in the reply to Reviewer: In Fig 5A the authors show significant difference in miR-145 expression between primary tumours and liver metastasis (pAre the methods appropriate and well described?) If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls? If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown? If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review? If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:
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