

Format for ANSWERING REVIEWERS

October 10, 2014



Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the edited manuscript in Word format (file name: 13163-edited-finished.doc).

Title: MicroRNA-1290 promotes esophageal squamous cell carcinoma proliferation and metastasis by SCAI

Author: Ming Li, Xiao-Yan He, Zhi-Mei Zhang, Shuo Li, Li-Hua Ren, Ri-Sheng Cao, Ya-Dong Feng, Yin-Lin Ji, Ye Zhao, Rui-Hua Shi

Name of Journal: *World Journal of Gastroenterology*

ESPS Manuscript NO: 13163

The manuscript has been improved according to the suggestions of reviewers:

1 Format has been updated

2 Revision has been made according to the suggestions of the reviewer

- (1) content is sometimes difficult to understand in the current version (eg in Results 3.1 the authors state: "Our results demonstrated that the relative increased folds of miR-1290 expression was markedly upregulated (>7 times)...". Furthermore, the legends and axes of the figures are insufficient at this stage (eg: legends should contain explanation of all abbreviations used in the graphs such as nc, inc, inhi etc. Or: figure 6b: x-axis not correct labelled).

Thank for the nice suggestion. The explanation of all abbreviations used in the graphs such as nc, inc, inhi have inserted to the graphs, also corrected label in figure 6b.

- (2) I did not find any information about a potential neoadjuvant treatment of the included patients. This information is vital as neoadjuvant treatment could influence miRNA expression pattern.

Thank for the valuable suggestion. We have provided the clinic information about the neoadjuvant treatment in manuscript line 121.

- (3) The authors use only one small nuclear RNA (U6) as control, and I couldn't find any info or data on the expression level of this small nuclear RNA in the different samples (should be comparable across samples).

Thanks for nice suggestion. We have added the explanation of small nuclear RNA (U6) as control in manuscript line 607. We have also indicated the explanation of U6 in our manuscript line 153.

- (4) However, in Results 3.1: the authors use scatter blots, box plots and the Median to compare groups. This implicates that the data do not underlie normal Gaussian distribution what mandates the use of non-parametric statistical tests.

Thank for good point. Using the nonparametric tests – one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to test normal distribution of our data, the result revealed it fits approximately normal distribution. The value of Kolmogorov-Smirnov is 0.773 and the value of Asymp.sig is 0.588.

- (5) The authors state that they use the TNM classification according to the WHO. I couldn't find the provided reference "Bosman FT, Carneiro F, Hruban RH, Theise ND. WHO classification of tumours of the digestive

system: World Health Organization, 2010:410- 417” . However, as far as I am aware, AJCC and UICC both use classifications that have N0/N1/N2/N3 stages and not only N0 and N1 stages. Furthermore, there is usually a distinction between Stage I - Stage IV disease. On which basis do the authors choose to just compare N0 versus N1, and why do they combine Stage I and II in one group versus Stage III (Especially given that Stage I and Stage II both are defined as disease Stages without lymph node metastasis compared to higher Stage disease) ? In addition, the allocation of patients into T1+2 versus T3+4 or G1 versus G2-4 groups seems random. The authors should explain why the combine patients into the respective groups. Does maybe the direct comparison between all groups (N0-N3, T1-T4, Stage I - Stage IV) result in non-significant differences between groups due to small sample size? Or is there a reason of combining patients to these groups?

Thank for good suggestion. The reference of TNM classification according to WHO has been corrected in manuscript line 482. Due to small sample size, we only combined the data of patients to new groups.

(6) The statement “Hence, upregulated miR-1290 expression was closely related to ESCC progression and metastasis.” is in my opinion not supported by the data presented in this part. The authors should re-phrase.

Thank for proper suggestion, we have re-phrased the sentence in manuscript line 262.

3 References and typesetting were corrected

We have checked the references and typesetting in our manuscript. Thank you very much.

At last, we agree to the language editing by company you assigned to. Thanks a lot!

Sincerely yours,

Ming li

Ming Li, MD
Department of Gastroenterology
The First Affiliated Hospital of Nanjing Medical University
Nanjing, 210009, Jiangsu Province, China;
Telephone: +86-25-83674636 Fax: +86-25-83718836
E-mail: limingibm@sina.com.