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Reviewer's report:

The first main concern is that cartilage sample has been mentioned several times in abstract and methods but none of the results were related to cartilage. Please clarify.

Last part of the method of immunofluorescence of OA synovium membranes (Page 7 line 24) is duplicated from monolayer culture methods and is incorrect. There are several other similar mistakes.

The authors claimed the tissue was snap frozen but the section was conducted using microtome which is for paraffin embedded tissue. Please clarify.

Please clarify the function of polymyxin B for the reader.

TGFβ, TNFα, LPS, and IL-6 were used to treat OA FLS. Why these four molecules? Why these concentrations? Why only TNFα was tested in OA synovium? Since TNFα and ED-A fibronectin was stained on different sections, it is hard to say if they are co-localized.

RAW264.7 macrophages were treated with 100ng/ml LPS as a positive control in all comparisons. Why this concentration? In figure 5 legend, LPS concentration was, however, 1ng/ml. Also, the result of positive control, LPS group, varied group by group. Why is that? It seems this model generated unstable results.

This sentence is vague. Please rephrase. (Page 3, line 9)

Enzymatic digestion has been mentioned twice. (Page 4 line 21), (Page 5 line 25) (Page 11, line 16). What is the enzyme used?

Please clearly state the goal of the study in abstract and introduction.

Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

No
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.

No

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 recommend additional statistical review

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

Needs some language corrections before being published
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