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Author’s response to reviews:

10, Mar 2016

Dr. Armelle T. Mbaveng
BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine Editorial Office
BioMed Central
236 Gray's Inn Road
London WC1X 8HB
United Kingdom
Email: info@biomedcentral.com

Dear Dr. Armelle T. Mbaveng,
Thank you very much for the expeditious review of our manuscript entitled Gejjigajakyak Decoction inhibits the motility and tumorigenesis of colorectal cancer cells which was submitted for consideration of publication in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine (BCAM-D-16-00097). We have addressed all of the comments made by the Reviewers and provided a detailed response on the following pages.

The main change was:

a) We have revised Figure 5 and Table 1 according to the reviewers comments.

b) We have revised Abstract, Methods, Results, and Discussion according to the reviewers comments and have improved the whole manuscript with respect to language.

Once again, we appreciate your assistance with this manuscript, and hope that the revised manuscript will be suitable for publication in BMC Complementary and Alternative Medicine.

Sincerely yours,

Sincerely,

Dr. Kyung Keun Kim

Department of Pharmacology,

Chonnam National University Medical School,

Hak-Dong 5, Dong-Ku,

Kwangju 501-746, South Korea.

E-mail: kimkk@chonnam.ac.kr; Tel: +82-62-220-4235; Fax: +82-62-223-4018

Detailed Response to Reviewer 1 Comments:

Thank you for your efforts and comments on our study. Your suggestions are really helpful to improve the presentation of our data. Our response to each point is listed below.
1. Abstract, methods, replace CRC cell motility by motility of CRC cells; replace examined in by examined by.

A: Thanks for your comments. We have corrected it.

2. Abstract, results, insert comma between HCT116 and CRC cells.

A: Thanks for your comments. We have corrected it.

3. Abstract, results, second last line replace "(MS)/MS" by "LC-MS".

A: Thanks for your comments. We have corrected it.

4. In vivo should be italic.

A: Thanks for your comments. We have corrected it.

5. In Table 1, column three, how you identified that the said phenolic compounds are present in understudy herbs, as nothing is mentioned in methodology or results.

A: Thanks for your critical comments. GJD is comprised of Cinnamomi Ramulus, Glycyrrhizae Radix, Paeonieae Radix, Zingiberis Rhizoma, and Ziziphi Fructus. These five herbs were reported to contain phenolic acids, coumarins, tannins, flavanones, flavonols, stilbenes, and phenolic volatile oils, which may have anti-cancer properties [2]. It is well-known that these antioxidant and phenolic compounds affect cell motility, such as cinnamic acid [31], eugenol [32], and 2-hydroxycinnamaldehyde [33] from Cinnamomi Ramulus; 18-glycyrrhetinic acid [34] and isoliquiritigenin [35, 36] from Glycyrrhizae Radix; adenosine [37], betulinic acid [38], oleanolic acid [39, 40], paeoniflorin [41], paeonol [42], and -tocopherol [43] from Paeonieae Radix; gingerol [44-46], and 6-shogaol [47-49] from Zingiberis Rhizoma.

So, based on these references but not from our present results, we summarized ingredients and doses of these five herbs in Table 1. We also inserted their respective references to corresponding antioxidants and phenolic compounds into Table 1 and these are mentioned in end of Results (page 15).
6. Language of communication is very poor, please consult some of your colleague proficient in English write up. The whole manuscript needs much improvement with respect to language. It is beyond the function of reviewer/editor to improve the language of manuscript, please do it at your own.

A: Thanks for your valuable comments. We have improved the whole manuscript with respect to language and have revised Abstract, Methods, Results, and Discussion according to the reviewers comments.

Detailed Response to Reviewer 2 Comments:

Thank you for your efforts and comments on our study. Your suggestions are really helpful to improve the presentation of our data. Our response is listed below.

Paper is correct. I only recommend to put a dotted reference line on graph taking as reference the control group.

A: We appreciate your constructive comments. We have revised Figure 5b according to the reviewers comment.