Editor's Comment:

Authors' response to Dr. M.A Inayathullaah is not clear to me. Just a response like, 'All corrections are done', without details showing what was done to address Dr. Inayathullaah's comments, it is very hard for the review and/or editors to locate the new modifications and evaluate the revision for different previous questions. It is noted that it is not the reviewer's responsibility to locate and figure out how did authors address their questions from the manuscript.

In addition, I did find clear revisions in the 2nd version revised manuscript addressing Dr. Inayathullaah's suggestions. For example, the title seems not changed in the second revision as provided in the record, and the 're-sumulation' suggestion was not clearly addressed. If authors think some suggestions are not reasonable, detailed rebuttal should be given, in this case, the response, 'All corrections are done', would be dishonest and not acceptable. (May editor office sent the wrong file? Please double check.)

Furthermore, in Dr. Inayathullaah's 2nd round comments, it reads, 'There is no change for me from my earlier comments. Still my suggested corrections were not carried out.', which can be a serious problem regarding the revision and should be addressed and explained in detail by authors.

Therefore, I will suggest sending back the revision to authors. Detailed responses and explanations for each comments from Dr. Inayathullaah (in both rounds) are requested to be listed in the response letter/form. The 2nd revision that I got is not acceptable for publication without considering and clearly addressing one of the reviewers' comments.

Editor's Details:

Dr. Meng Ma
Associate Professor, Anhui University, Hefei, Anhui, China
And
Icahn Institute for Genomics and Multiscale Biology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, USA