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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor,
Thank you for your helpful comments concerning our manuscript entitled “An in vitro study of the effect of 5-ALA-mediated photodynamic therapy on oral squamous cell carcinoma” (ID: OHEA-D-20-00183R1). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. Thank you very much for your approval of our last modification. We have also studied comments carefully and have made correction at this time. Revised portion are marked in red in the “Revised Manuscript”, and uploaded the file "Response letter to reviewers". The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are list below.
Sincerely,
Liangpeng Xu

Reviewer reports:
Reviewer 1: Dear Authors thank you very much for your comments. Regardless you added necessary references and further explanations you do not convince myself that 5 ALA mediated PDT could only serve as inhibiting factor of growth of OSCC. You have mentioned the inquired paper "…. Photochem Phobiolog. 2019. Mar; 95(2):635-43", however you have not described potential of PDT on uncontrolled proliferation and growth. Please let the readers think about possible uncontrolled effect of PDT. You are very bravely stated that PDT may be valid and alternative approach for clinical treatment. Dear Authors, please reconsider that statement with more critical view. The further studies must approve your hypothesis. Please correct the title of your work as we agreed that is the in vitro study. The paper could be accepted after major revision.
Responds: Thank you for your carefully reading and commenting on our manuscript, and it must have cost you time and energy. I am sorry for the inconvenience caused by our loose conclusion. Thank you for the constructive suggestion, and we have added the related description about possible uncontrolled effect of PDT in the Discussion section now. In addition, we have modified the conclusions in the manuscript according to your suggestions. We will also explore these possible uncontrolled effects in future clinical applications of PDT. We have revised the title of the article to emphasize that this is an in vitro study. Thank you very much for your recognition and approval of our research.

Reviewer 3: Thank you very much for revising the manuscript to improve clarity and presentation. I still feel that the description of the method could be refined further to provide a clear view how your experiment progressed through its stages. One of the objectives of publishing is to share the scientific knowledge in a way that another person who is interested is able to replicate your experiment to re-test your findings. In this context I still feel there is room to improve the way you have written your methodology. Responds: Thank you very much for reading and commenting on our manuscript. I am sorry for the inconvenience caused by our half-baked description. We appreciate for your constructive suggestions, and your opinions make a great sense. We have tried our best to make betterment on our manuscript according to your advices. We have reedited the methods section now, and we also retooled the description of our experimental cell groups for clarity.

We appreciate for Editors and Reviewers’ warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.