

Response to the editor and reviewers

Thank you very much for the comments and the positive remarks about our manuscript (Manuscript No. 34061) submitted to World Journal of Gastroenterology entitled: “Generation of glyceraldehyde-derived advanced glycation end-products (GA-AGEs) in pancreatic cancer cells and the potential of extracellular GA-AGEs to promote tumors”. We were happy to hear that the classification of our paper was “grade C (good)”.

We accepted the editor comments and the reviewer comments, and revised our manuscript and provide editor the data that editor need to publish our manuscript. Please find enclosed the revised manuscript in Word format (File name: 34061-revised manuscript).

Title: Generation of glyceraldehyde-derived advanced glycation end-products (GA-AGEs) in pancreatic cancer cells and the potential of extracellular GA-AGEs to promote tumors

Name of Journal: World Journal of Gastroenterology

Manuscript No. 34061

Column: Basic Study

Reviewer code: 00504150

Editor comment #1

The statements on top page;

Institutional review board statement.

Informed consent statement.

Conflict-of interest statement.

Data sharing statement.

Institutinal animal care and use committee statement.

Animal care and use statement.

Biostatics statement.

Answer 1

We described those items of statements and sentence that we need in this study. We need not to provide editor the certificate of those statements without “Biostatistics statement”.

We provide PDF data of “Biostatistics statement” to editor. More, we provide the PDF file which we explain that we did not need the statement of other items.

Editor comment #2

The indication about “scientific research process”:

Answer #2

We described the scientific research process followed the comments of editor. This scientific research process was check by the language editing.

Editor comment #3

The indication about COMMENTS

Answer #3

We revised the comments followed editor’s indications.

Editor comments #4

If we described the foundation, we must provide “grant application forms” to editor.

Answer #4

We provide data (information) of web page for grants and foundation.

Editor comments #5

Editor wants the documents of copyright t about this manuscript (the PDF file).

Answer #5

We proved the data of PDF file about copyright assignment to editor.

Editor comments #6

Editor wants the ppt file of figures so that editor can edit the data of figures easily.

Answer #6

We provide editor the ppt and pptx file of figures and supplemental figures.

<Our revision without the indication of Editor>

Revision 1: We revised the statistical significant symbol. In first manuscript, we use * and ** for symbol of statistical significance. However, these symbol were changed “a” and “b”. We revised our Figure Legends and Figures in ppt (and pptx) file. All * and ** were revised to “a” and “b”.

Revision 2: We revised the units for the concentration of chemical substances. We used “%” for the unit of concentrations of chemical substances in our first manuscript. However, we checked the guidelines for Units, and we use “mL/L” and “g/L” for the units of concentration of chemical substances. More, we revised the unit of glyceraldehyde (GA). We used “mM” for the concentration of GA in our first manuscript. In this revise, we described “mmol/L” for the unit of GA in our manuscript, Figures, and Supplement Figures.

Revision 3: We revised the “Immunostaining of Materials & Methods”. On first manuscript, we described “DAB”. We described “3,3’-diaminoenzidine tetrahydrochloride because it is the official name of this chemical substance.

Revision 4: We revised the description of Reference 20, 21, 22, and 32. The lack of the author’s name was added.

Reviewer’s comment #1

On pate 4 and 15 in first manuscript. For our description about PANC-1 statement. To this reviewer, it is totally not clear if this statement is needed. What is the purpose of this statement?

Answer 1

We deleted the description of the statement of PANC-1 because the use of PANC-1 didn’t be limited to investigate.

Reviewer’s comment # 2

On page7in first manuscript (On page 9 in revised manuscript). “Confocal microscopy was performed” should be “Confocal microscopic examination was performed.”

Answer 2

We accepted the comment of reviewer and revised our manuscript. And, we revised “Confocal” to “Optical” because we written the uncollected information in our first manuscript.

Reviewer’s comment #3

On page 8 in first manuscript (On page 10 in revised manuscript). “Data were expressed as” should be “Data are expressed as.

Answer 3

We accepted the comment of reviewer and revised our manuscript. The sentences of data analysis which were in the article (material and methods) and figure legends were corrected (On page 23-24 in revised manuscript).

Reviewer’s comment #4

The rank of English of first manuscript was “Grade B”

Answer 4

We revised the language of our manuscript. And we proved the language editing certificate to editor.

We hope that our paper has been revised satisfactorily and will be accepted for publication in your journal. Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have additional suggestions on improving the paper.

Yours sincerely,

Takanobu Takata, PhD.
Department of Advanced Medicine
Medical Research Institute
Kanazawa Medical University
1-1 Daigaku, Uchinada, Ishikawa 920-0293, Japan.
TEL.: +81-76-286-2211 (Extension line; 3968)
E-mail: takajjjj@kanazawa-med.ac.jp