

Point Response Letter (An Example)

Virologica Sinica

Dear Editor Prof. ###,

Thank you for your decision letter concerning our manuscript (ID VS-####-####) entitled "####", and your time regarding for our revision. I also appreciate all the critical comments from you and reviewers. We have carefully considered the comments and revised the manuscript accordingly. With these improvements, we hope that the current version can meet the Journal's standards for publication. The following is a point-by-point response to all those comments and a list of changes we have made to the manuscript.

Sincerely
XXX

Point-by-point responses to the comments of the Editor and reviewers, and a list of changes are:

(The comments of the Editor and reviewers are in italics and blue color, which are followed by our responses.)

Editor:

Comments to the Author

*The manuscript has been reviewed by three experts in the field, and all gave quite positive comments. However, all three reviewers raised a major common concern on the data related to *** signaling. Thus, it would be better to remove figure 3, figure 4B, figure 5 from the current manuscript and focus the manuscript on the *** interaction findings.*

A: We would like to thank the Editor for all those useful comments. According to your suggestion, we removed Fig. 3, Fig. 4B and Fig. 5 from the current manuscript and focused the manuscript on the *** interaction findings.

Reviewer: 1

Comments to the Author

*The manuscript by XX et al. describes the interactions between virus Protein ** and a host factor called **, concludes that***, and proposes that this is a mechanism that***. The story and experimental designs are both interesting, but I found that some of the data are not very convincing.*

A: We would like to thank the respected reviewer 1 for his useful comments. We have tried to consider all comments revised the manuscript based on the comments.

Major concerns:

*Q1: First, in Figure 2C, the authors claimed that ***. There may be some difference, but it is just not that convincing. Can the authors repeat the Western blot several times, quantify the intensity of the bands, and provide a statistical analysis of the differences.*

A1: Thanks for the good suggestions. We did repeat the Western blot for several times. Now we have quantified the intensity of the bands of three independent results and provided the statistical analysis of the difference (revised edition: Fig. 2D). The results showed that ***. This information has been added **in page 5 line 17**.

*Q2: This study used *** strategy in mice, but the route of administration hadn't been described. The details about *** should be provided in this study. The amounts of every plasmids transfected should be noted in Methods or Figure legends.*

A2: Regarding the route of vaccination, we have used ***, and the information has been revised accordingly **in page # line ##** (in Materials and Methods subtitle ***). The amounts of every plasmids transfected have been noted in Methods or Figure legends of revised manuscript.

*Q3: Third, in Figure 3C, if ** leads to degradation of **, then *** should lead to similar luciferase signal as in ***. Instead, Figure 3C shows that *** leads to much lower signal than ***.*

A3: That's very good question. We should address this question in the paper. Our thought is that ***. However, ***. To answer these questions, more intensive studies need to be done. Currently, we don't know the answers yet. Probably we may address them later in our next related paper.

Q4:

A4: This information has been added in **page 7 line 17**.

*Q5: Last, overall the manuscript is clearly written. But it still has numerous grammatical errors that need to be fixed. Also, ** needs to be spelled out in title and abstract.*

A5: We agree with the reviewer. We have revised the manuscript carefully to correct the grammatical errors and changed the "***" to "****" in title and abstract.

Reviewer: 2

Comments to the Author

*This manuscript by XX et al. describes ***. They first characterized the interaction between ** and ** using yeast two-hybrid system and immunofluorescence. They further found that ***. Moreover, they identified ***. Although ** has been extensively studied, its function and cellular partner are largely unknown. This study provides valuable information for understanding the function of **, which may mediate ***.*

A: We would like to thank this respected reviewer for his useful comments.

Major points:

*Q1. In this study, the author showed that ***. But, ***. It is should be addressed in the discussion.*

A1: We agree with the reviewer and have addressed this question in the revised paper. (Page #, Line ## to ## and Page ##, Line ###-###.) We didn't address much because our paper is focus on ***. But we can explain more here. The results that *** was published in 2005. Later studies have drawn different conclusions. In contrast to these results, an enhancement of replication of the virus is observed at low moi, which is consistent with previous findings using recombinant studies [ref 13]. Recombinant studies using ***, show *** [J. Virol. 2007; ##: ##-##]. The recombinant ## studies by XX and colleagues also showed that *** [J. Virol. 2010; ##: ##-##]. Lastly, *** [J. Virol. 2015; ##: ##-##].

Minor points:

Q2. 1. Typo and language problems, P4, line36, "high virulence with a more than 35% mortality rate of" should be "high virulence with a more than 35% mortality rate "

(revised edition: **P3, line 34**)

P4, line37, "a Group β coronavirus" should be "a β coronavirus"

(revised edition: **P3, line 34**)

P7, line144, "14 positive clones" better wrote as "Fourteen", the same as "Eight host proteins"

(revised edition: **P6, line 138, 139**)

in line145, please pay attention to English writing style

(revised edition: **P6, line 142**)

.....

Anyway, please carefully edit and check the text.

A2: Thanks for the suggestion. The manuscript has been revised as suggested and showed above. And more careful proofread has been done.

Modification requests from the Editorial Office:

Q: Please add "COMPLIANCE WITH ETHICS GUIDELINES" and "AUTHOR

CONTRIBUTIONS” sections. The guidelines to authors and examples are attached.

A: The required sections have been added accordingly.
