

Response to the editors and reviewer

Ms. Ref. No.: 58632

Title: Proliferation and tenogenic differentiation of BMSCs in a porous collagen sponge scaffold

Authors: Bingyu Zhang, Pu Xu, Qing Luo, Guanbin Song

To Reviewer #1

Comments: *Tenogenic differentiation of BMSCs in tendon tissue engineering is actively investigated for developing affective therapeutics. Authors in this MS have proposed that collagen sponge-based 3D culture is more favorable for cells to respond to growth factors and demonstrated that TGF- β 1 is more effective in the tenogenic differentiation of BMSCs compared to GDF-7 and IGF-1. The experimental plan is properly laid out and significant data are obtained. These findings are helpful towards a better understanding of the role of growth factors in regulating the tenogenic differentiation of BMSCs in tendon tissue engineering. I have no hesitation in recommending this MS for publication.*

Answer: We feel great thanks for your professional review work on our article.

To the Science editor

Comment 1: *I found no “Author contribution” section. Please provide the author contributions.*

Answer: Thank you for your comment. It has been supplemented in the revised manuscript.

Comment 2: *I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).*

Answer: It has been submitted on the system.

Comment 3: *I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.*

Answer: It has been submitted as “58632-Figures.ppt” on the system.

Comment 4: *I found the authors did not write the “article highlight” section. Please write the*

“article highlights” section at the end of the main text.

Answer: It has been supplemented in the revised manuscript.

Comment 5: *Please don't include any *, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration; and for statistical significance, please use superscript letters. Statistical significance is expressed as ^aP < 0.05, ^bP < 0.01 (P > 0.05 usually does not need to be denoted). If there are other series of P values, ^cP < 0.05 and ^dP < 0.01 are used, and a third series of P values is expressed as ^eP < 0.05 and ^fP < 0.01.*

Answer: It has been corrected in the revised manuscript.

To Editorial office director

Comment: *I have checked the comments written by the science editor.*

Answer: We feel great thanks for your professional review work on our article.

To Company editor-in-chief

Comments: *I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted with major revisions. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Before final acceptance, authors need to correct the issues raised by the editor to meet the publishing requirements.*

Answer: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for the comments. We have made the necessary corrections in accordance with the “Peer-Review Report” and the “Criteria for Manuscript Revision”.