

Peer Review File

Article information: <http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-2948>

Reviewer A:

Comment 1: The authors usually refer to treatment or reversal of fibrosis but instead they should use the terms prevent or mitigate fibrosis.

The text needs editing in order to avoid too long phrases or repetitions

A table with the factors named in the text (at least the less common ones) and their main role (briefly) should be of help for the non expert. e Col-XIV/undulin, E-cadherin hemopexin. TGR5 and Dpp4 HOTAIR, YAP etc

English language: correct grammar and syntax errors.

Reply 1: The authors would like to thank the reviewer for these suggestions. We have changed the word to prevent or mitigate fibrosis. We have modified all the long phrases into smaller sentences. In addition, we have provided a table with the factors named in the text for better understanding. Lastly, we have significantly improved the grammar and syntax errors in the revised manuscript.

Comment 2. Lines 115-123: too many factors in one paragraph that do not seem connected please rewrite the phrase.

Reply 2: As suggested, we have revised the phrase for better clarity.

Comment 3. Line 194: the phrase In normal physiological ,,,,,, storage cells for vitamin A does not fit very well in the paragraph and it is repeated later in the text

Reply 3: We fully agree. As suggested, we have removed the mentioned sentence.

Comment 4. Line 203-4 change the phrase physiological and pathological role in physiology

Reply 4: Thanks for this comment. As suggested, we have revised the sentence.

Comment 5. Lines 239-241: The phrase Contractile...wounded area is not well integrated in the text

Reply 5: According to your advice, we have removed the mentioned sentence.

Comment 6. Line 267: its levels; please make clear

Reply 6: We have modified the sentence for better clarity.

Comment 7. Lines 287-298: The whole text should be added in the section about MMPs. A scheme showing MMPs structure would be very useful. In the current

section 16 members are reported while in a previous paragraph the number was 23 MMPs; please check.

Reply 7: Thanks for this important suggestion. We have revised the text and added the mentioned information in the MMPs section. The actual number of MMPs is 23 and we have removed the incorrect information. We have omitted to add another figure showing MMPs' structure because respective figures are provided in cited references dealing with MMPs.

Reviewer B:

Comment 1: Please look at notes in the highlighted text.

Reply 1: Thanks for the annotation of the pdf-file. This was really helpful.

Comment 2: Your figures are well and adequately arrange, however the resume in the table is not systematic. There are in vitro studies mixed with in vivo studies.

Reply 2: The authors would like to thank the reviewer for appreciating the figures. The authors fully agree that in vitro studies have been mixed with in vivo in the mentioned table. However, most of these studies describe both in vitro and in vivo experiments. Hence, we have kept the order in the table and hope the reviewer can agree with us.

Comment 3: In addition, this publication is worthy of inclusion:

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5488778/>

Reply 3: That is true. We have added the mentioned paper in the main manuscript (new reference 77) as well as in table 1 of the revised manuscript.