

How to reply to the editor:

In reply to the referee's main criticism of paper, it is possible to say that:

One minor point raised by the referee concerns of the extra composition of the reaction mixture in Figure 1. This has now been corrected. Further minor changes had been made on page 3, paragraph 1 (line 3-8) and 2 (line 6-11). These do not affect our interpretation of the result.

2. I have read the referee's comments very carefully and conclude that the paper has been rejected on the sole grounds that it lack toxicity data. I admit that I did not include a toxicity table in my article although perhaps I should have done. This was for the sake of brevity rather than an error or omission.

3. Thank you for your letter of – and for the referee's comments concerning our manuscript entitled "". We have studied their comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with their approval.

4. I enclosed a revised manuscript which includes a report of additional experiments done at the referee's suggestion. You will see that our original findings are confirmed.

5. We are sending the revised manuscript according to the comments of the reviewers. Revised portion are underlined in red.

6. We found the referee's comments most helpful and have revised the manuscript

7. We are pleased to note the favorable comments of reviewers in their opening sentence.

8. Thank you for your letter. I am very pleased to learn that our manuscript is acceptable for publication in Cancer Research with minor revision.

9. We have therefore completed a further series of experiments, the result of which are summarized in Table 5. From this we conclude that intrinsic factor is not account.

10. We deleted the relevant passage since they are not essential to the contents of the paper.

11. I feel that the reviewer's comments concerning Figures 1 and 2 result from a misinterpretation of the data.

12. We would have include a non-protein inhibitor in our system, as a control, if one had been available.

13. We prefer to retain the use of Table 4 for reasons that it should be clear from the new paragraph inserted at the end of the Results section.

14. Although reviewer does not consider it is important to measure the temperature of the cells, we consider it essential.

15. The running title has been changed to "".

16. The Materials and Methods section now includes details for measuring uptake of isotope and assaying hexokinase.

17. The concentration of HAT media (page12 paragraph 2) was incorrectly stated in the original manuscript. This has been rectified. The authors are grateful to the referees for pointing out their error.

18. As suggested by both referees, a discussion of the possibility of laser action on chromosome has been included (page16, paragraph 2).

19. We included a new set of photographs with better definition than those originally submitted and to which a scale has been added.

20. Following the suggestion of the referees, we have redrawn Figure 3 and 4.

21. Two further papers, published since our original submission, have been added to the text and Reference section. These are:

22. We should like to thank the referees for their helpful comments and hope that we have now produced a more balance and better account of our work. We trust that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.

23. I greatly appreciate both your help and that of the referees concerning improvement to this paper. I hope that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication.

24. I should like to express my appreciation to you and the referees for suggesting how to improve our paper.

25. I apologize for the delay in revising the manuscript. This was due to our doing an additional experiment, as suggested by referees.