Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed a modified version of my newspaper column “Professor Gives Insight into Research at OSU”. To address the concerns and comments raised by the 3 reviewers, I made the following changes to improve and clarify the manuscript. It is my hope that these changes make the manuscript acceptable for publication in Microreviews in Cell and Molecular Biology.

Sincerely,

Sarah Spradlin

**Reviewer 1:**

1. Briefly state if you found the comments of Reviewer 1 helpful or not.

Reviewer 1’s comments were not very helpful. I think they had a very narrow interpretation of the prompt. However, their jarring judgement of the importance made it clear that improvements were needed.

2. What changes did you make to your manuscript as a result of the comments of Reviewer 1?

As a result, I defined and provided symptoms for the topics of the research. I also made the importance of the research very obvious.

**Reviewer 2:**

1. Briefly state if you found the comments of Reviewer 2 helpful or not.

Reviewer 2’s comments were helpful.

2. What changes did you make to your manuscript as a result of the comments of Reviewer 2?

As a result, I took out the paragraph regarding a specific manuscript and instead focused on the research in more broad terms that are easily understandable to a lay audience.

**Reviewer 3:**

1. Briefly state if you found the comments of Reviewer 3 helpful or not.

Reviewer 3’s comments were helpful. However, some of their commentary came down to personal preference.

2. What changes did you make to your manuscript as a result of the comments of Reviewer 3?

As a result, I changed the formatting from 3 columns to 2 columns and provided further explanation on the research.