

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS



December 29, 2014

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 15258-review.doc).

Title: Nociceptin effect on intestinal motility depends on ORL1 receptors and NOS co-localization

Author: Andrei Sibaeve, Jakub Fichna, Dieter Saur, Birol Yucece, Jean-Pierre Timmermans, Martin Storr

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 15258

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

(1) **Reviewer 02445734**

Very nice work showing differential effects of ORL1 in the ileum and colon.

The Authors would like to thank the Reviewer for their appreciation of our work.

Minor change only on page 15, last paragraph: "Immunohistochemistry localized ORL1 staining in the majority of myenteric neurons....": add here: "of the colon..." then continue.

The sentence has been corrected, as suggested.

(2) **Reviewer 02521800**

Dear Editor, I have read and evaluated the manuscript (ms) entitled " Nociceptin effect on intestinal motility depends on ORL1 receptors and NOS colocalization". Overall this ms is well conducted and written. The hypothesis is also interest and successful. It seems that the authors spendd so much efforts to drawn a conclude.

The Authors would like to thank the Reviewer for their appreciation of our work and for excellent suggestions on how to improve our manuscript.

I have only some minor comments about this ms as;

1. I recommend that, sub-sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5 should be shortened. Becuase, the reader could miss the main aim of this study until reach here to the main findings and discussion.

The methods in these sections (in particular design of AS ODNs in 2.1, primer sequence and minor methodological details in 2.2, methodological details in 2.5) have been adjusted specifically for this study and are reported for the first time. Therefore we would prefer to keep these paragraphs in their current shape.

2. The comma should come after the bracket for reference, throughout the ms.

The reference style has been adjusted, as suggested.

3. In the 2.4 section multichannel stimulation. were pinned... please remove the comma.

The comma was removed, as suggested.

4. Why not expressed the data as mean \pm SD, instead of mean \pm SEM. What is the rationale of this? Please explain.

We would like to thank the Reviewer for this valuable comment. To the best of our knowledge both manners of presenting the data are acceptable and – if properly analyzed, what we believe is also in our case – provide the most accurate information on the reported phenomena. Therefore we decided to maintain the current form of presentation (mean \pm /-SEM) and we hope that the Reviewer will support this decision.

5. Please put one or more reference/s for the second sentence of the Discussion.

An additional reference has been added, as suggested.

References and typesetting were corrected

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

Sincerely yours,
Martin Storr