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Author’s response to reviews:

List of Responses

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Network Pharmacology Approach to Uncover the Mechanism Governing the Effect of Radix Achyranthis Bidentatae on Osteoarthritis” (ID: BCAM-D-19-01738). Further review is of great significance to our article. We have carefully studied all the comments and made corrections again, hoping for approval. We are very grateful to the reviewers for their careful and professional revision. We have benefited a lot from their comments. Thank you very much! The responds to the reviewer’s comments and the main corrections in the paper are as following:

Editor Comments:
1. Please change your Article Type to Research article.
Response: Thank you for your guidance. We have corrected the type of article.

2. Please change the Materials and Methods heading to Methods.
Response: Thank you. We've changed it to "Methods". (Methods section, line 12, page 6)

3. Please add a “Conclusions” section after the “Discussion” section. This should state clearly the main conclusions of the research article and give a clear explanation of their importance and relevance.
Response: Thanks for your advice. A conclusion is indeed needed, as suggested by the editor. We added to that. (Conclusions section, line 24-28, page 16 and line 1-6, page 17)

4. Please remove the " from the Consent for publication section.
Response: Thank you. We've removed that part.

5. We note that you have not included a ‘Funding’ section in the Declarations. All sources of funding for the research reported should be declared. If no funding was obtained for your study, we still require this section to be included with the statement “No funding was obtained for this study”.
Response: Thank you. We have Funding support and have corrected this by writing it in the 'Funding’ section. (Funding section, page 18)

6. Please remove the funding information from the Acknowledgements and include it in the Funding section instead. If you have no further acknowledgements, please put “Not Applicable” in the Acknowledgements section.
Response: Thank you. Two parts have been replaced, and the Acknowledgements section of the supplement. (Acknowledgements section, page 19)

7. Please state in the cover letter whether the images in figure 1 is your own or taken from another source.
Response: Thank you. We made some changes to figure 1. This is what we do.

Reviewer #2:
Main comments:
1. I would recommend avoiding multiple "XXXX et al" in Paragraph #4 of the Background, unless they are well known.
Response: The reviewer's question pointed out the inadequacy of our research. It is true that this writing is inappropriate and we have revised it. (Background section, line 28, page 4 and line 1-10, page 5)

2. The second paragraph of Page 8 (PDF) would need more references.
Response: Thanks to the reviewers for their careful review, we have added more references. (Background section, line 14, page 4)
References:


3. The Network Analyzer plugin software (Page 10). They are now called 'Apps' not plugin. Response: Thank you for your attention, we have revised it. (Results section, line 8, page 11)

4. Were both Network Analyzer and CytoNCA used to analyze the network properties? Response: Thank you for your attention. Both the Network Analyzer and CytoNCA are used to analyze network properties. Among them, network analyzer is used as the topological analysis between the drug active ingredients and disease target network. CytoNCA is used as topology analysis in PPI network.

5. It is not necessary to repeatedly say "Cytoscape software (Version 3.7.1)" in the manuscript. Just using "Cytoscape" should be enough. Response: Thank you. We have revised the full text.

6. Page 14: It is not clear what the first and the second screenings were and how the thresholds were different. This approach is not described in the Methods section. Response: Thank you for your review. Based on the analysis results of PPI's topological characteristics, we conducted two screening to obtain core gene. The screening condition is greater than the median of the results of each topology analysis. In the methods section, we have added. (Methods section, line 20-22, page 8)

7. The study focuses on the 63 common target genes, which are also referred to as core targets. I recommend these 'core' targets are defined in the Methods. Response: Thank you very much for your advice. Our focus is on common gene, and you're absolutely right. We added to that. (Methods section, line 8-10, page 7)

8. In each of the Supplementary Tables, descriptions of columns need to be added. Response: Thank you. We carefully checked the supplementary forms and further described them.

9. Currently, most figures do not have any legends. Response: We write about legends at the end of this article. We apologize for any inconvenience caused by the unclear location. We have made a further supplement to this. (Figure legend section, line 1-21, page 24 and line 1, page 25)
10. There are still numerous places with awkward or grammatically wrong expressions as well as a few paragraphs with only one sentence. To significantly improve the readability, I would recommend using a professional language editing service. 
Response: Due to our unprofessional English writing, we apologize for the inconvenience caused to your manuscript review. Professional language editing services have been used.