



Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro - UFRJ
Instituto de Microbiologia Paulo de Góes - IMPG
Departamento de Imunologia - Laboratório de Citocinas

Dr. Fang-Fang Ji
Scientific Editor, World J Exp Med

Ref: MS 34092

Dear Dr. Ji,

Please find enclosed a revised manuscript entitled *Surgical and immune reconstitution murine models in bone-marrow research: potential for exploring mechanisms in sepsis, trauma and allergy*, by Pedro Xavier-Elsas, Renato Nunes Ferreira and Maria Ignez C. Gaspar-Elsas, which has been thoroughly revised to address the concerns raised by the three reviewers. Below you will find a point-by-point reply to their comments, criticisms and suggestions.

Reviewer's code: 02714633

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Needs more evidence of these Models.

Reply: we have added all the available information on these models concerning the issues of interest (bone marrow research focusing on sepsis, trauma and allergy) to the revised manuscript

Reviewer's code: 00504800

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Overall, this is an extremely detailed, well referenced review of the potential role of the marrow in healing of animal surgical models of disease. The authors raise a number of good points, both about what is in the literature and what is left to do. The manuscript is rather long; the introductory portions (up to page 14) could be shortened somewhat. It needs some minor non-scientific English editing. I recommend it for publication after minor editing. Specific recommendations: - "Bone marrow" does not need a hyphen between bone and marrow.- The first section (pges 3-7) could use some subheadings to break up this long section.- Page 15, section f, second line: I would change to "how CAN complex strategies"...- Please make sure abbreviations are defined at first use; for example, on page 19, the abbreviation CLP is used but not defined until the paragraph below. Page 20: Please change "immunodepressed" to "immunoSUppressed", which is more commonly used and understood.- Page 31: I would suggest a concluding paragraph to summarize and tie concepts together at the end.



Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro - UFRJ
Instituto de Microbiologia Paulo de Góes - IMPG
Departamento de Imunologia - Laboratório de Citocinas

Reply: We are very thankful to this reviewer for the positive evaluation of our manuscript. On the specific points raised:

“The manuscript is rather long; the introductory portions (up to page 14 could be shortened somewhat.” The text has been revised to make it more concise and objective without losing information. Shortening was significant, since it now ends at page 13.

“It needs some minor non-scientific English editing. I recommend it for publication after minor editing. Specific recommendations: “Bone marrow” does not need a hyphen between bone and marrow. This has been corrected in the revised version. “how CAN complex strategies”. The change has been made.

“Please make sure abbreviations are defined at first use; for example, on page 19, the abbreviation CLP is used but not defined until the paragraph below.” We apologize for this and similar mistakes, which hopefully have been all corrected in the revised version.

“Please change “immunodepressed” to “immunoSUppressed”, which is more commonly used and understood.” We have made the change suggested, following Webster’s New Twentieth Century Dictionary, Unabridged, 2nd Ed., which features *immunosuppression*, hence *immunosuppressed*.

I would suggest a concluding paragraph to summarize and tie concepts together at the end. It has been done, to the best of our abilities. We hope it improves on the previous version.

Reviewer’s code: 03010350

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Dear editor. I read with great interest the article. After reading it, new ideas developed. I think that from this point of view, and with other readers of WJEM, as well as I will have new thoughts. The authors propose and discuss original experimental models, one of which I was very interested in and will refer to it. Therefore, I think that this article can be accepted. I would recommend cutting the section on the experimental model with sepsis. At the end of the article, the authors need to add a conclusion.

Reply: The authors are very thankful for the encouraging comments of this reviewer. We have tried to make clear in the revised version why we think the section on the experimental model with sepsis is an essential part of the paper, and omitting it would not only delete information that is important conceptually, but also make it harder to understand the remaining sections, since the discussion of a modular structure for the sepsis experiments, that matches a conceptual structure, is essential for the understanding of similar issues in the



Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro - UFRJ
Instituto de Microbiologia Paulo de Góes - IMPG
Departamento de Imunologia - Laboratório de Citocinas

EWI and ectopic lung transplantation models. We are glad to follow the referee's recommendation of adding a concluding section. A similar demand was made by another reviewer, and the same modification complies with the comments of both. We hope the novel concluding section is an improvement over the previous version of the paper.

Having thus addressed all points raised during the initial review, we hope the changes made will now make this manuscript acceptable to the Journal.

Best regards and thanks for your continuing support and understanding.

Pedro Xavier-Elsas, MD PhD

Associate Professor

Dept. Immunology, Instituto de Microbiologia Paulo de Góes, UFRJ.