

Response to reviewers' comments

1. Can the components in the section of Limitation and Choice be organized in the same order as the main body? Specifically, the first sentence is not specific considering that five approaches are already reviewed in the main body. TF approach is reviewed lastly and thus the 2nd sentence describing TF should be mentioned also lastly.

Thank you for the comments. We are sorry that the organization of this part is not satisfying and we have revised this part and also adjusted the order of the sentences.

2. In TF approach, forced expression is one type of roads and gene of interest in an expression cassette can be delivered by plasmid/expression construct, viral vector or transgenic (recombination of genomic sequences), but not by bacteria! From cited review, no bacteria is mentioned for “transfection”, too.

We are very sorry about this mistake and thank you so much for your careful review. Gene of interest in an expression cassette cannot be delivered by bacteria and we have revised.

3. Vertical lines in the table should be removed. Necessary legend should be provided, e.g., what \ is.

Once again, we sincerely thank you for your careful review. Vertical lines in the table have been removed. We have replaced '/' with '-' and added the necessary legends such as what "-" is, what "EB" is and so on. The details can be found in the revised manuscript.