

ANSWERING REVIEWERS



March 20, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 8762-edited.doc).

Title: Osteopontin knockdown suppresses the growth and angiogenesis of colon cancer cells

Author: Xin-Lin Wu, Kai-Jin Lin, Ai-Ping Bai, Wan-Xiang Wang, Xing-Kai Meng, Xiu-Lan Su, Ming-Xing Hou, Pei-De Dong, Jun-Jing Zhang, Zhao-Yang Wang, Lin Shi

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 8762

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1. Format has been updated

2. Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

(1) What is Fn?

Fn is the abbreviation of Fibronectin.

(2) The literature review is too long (417 words) before discussing their own data. The first paragraph should state their main findings directly.

The literature review has been revised as indicated.

(3) In the first paragraph, "Our preliminary studies have shown that OPN may influence tumor cell biological characteristics. The principal findings of this study were that both endogenous OPN expression (via stable transfection)". The two sentences mislead the readers that the two sentences are describing one study, in fact, as the references showed, they are two studies .

The two studies have been introduced separately in order to reduce misunderstanding.

(4) "The present study" means the authour's study, but the expression is often referred to other studies.

"The present study" has been deleted.

(5) In discussion, it is better to compare your own data with references, instead of repeating your own findings as the results.

The discussion section has been revised as requested.

(6) Figure: 1. Figure 3, the Y axis should be marked OPN mRNA instead of "... value" ; 2. Figure 5, Y axis should be marked with Cell proliferation (OD value). Same with other figures. The significance should be marked. 3. Figure 8, Y axis should state the concentration unit.

Figure 3: The expression of OPN mRNA was normalized to the levels of GAPDH and relative to the OPN levels in normal Lovo cells.

Figure 5 and Figure 8 has been deleted.

(7) Are the examiners blinded for the different cell lines?

To avoid any potential mistakes such as crossing culture of different type cells, the experiments were performed by the same specialist..

(8) What is the groups experience in performing this type of studies? References?
The reference with which method we regarded has been cited in the manuscript .

(9) Regarding the discussion. There are no discussion of the limitations, pitfalls and weaknesses of the study.
The discussion section has been updated.

(10) The discussion is only repeating the information from the introduction, methods and results.
We revised the discussion section as indicated.

(11) Many statements in the discussion lack references.
Some references have been added into the paper.

(12) Possible clinical applications of this finding need to be discussed more in detail
These has been revised in the discussion section.

(12) The experiments methods are adequate for the results. However, it would be better if they had used OPN overexpression in addition to silencing OPN.

The OPN overexpression model of Lovo will be established in the further study in order to provide more evidence to investigate the effects of OPN on colon cancer.

(13) The presentation of the results is marked by the repetition of data in figures and tables in all instances. Also, there is no point in Figs. 1 and 2 except perhaps as complementary online material. In fact, Figures 3 and 4 are quite superfluous as well, they could be combined in a single figure or table with the only vector that was used.

The superfluous figures and tables were just for review only and has been deleted.

(14) The title states incorrectly that the silencing OPN reduces angiogenesis, this has not been even tested.

The factors we detected by ELISA were related to angiogenesis. In vitro and in vivo assay systems for study of the silencing OPN reduces angiogenesis and the possible mechanism will be established in the further study.

(15) CCK-8 = Sigma WST kit?
Yes, CCK-8 = Sigma WST kit.

(16) Why the repetition of the lanes in Fig. 1?
In order to minimize the probability of error in the process of experiment.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

4 Many grammatical or typographical errors have been revised.

Thank you again for publishing our manuscript in the *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

Sincerely yours,

Lin Shi

Lin Shi, MD
Department of Pathology,
The Affiliated Hospital Of Inner Mongolia Medical University
Inner Mongolian Autonomous Region, China
Huhhot 010059
Fax: +86-471-6637678
E-mail: shilinsd2003@ aliyun.com