Dear editors and reviewers,

We are grateful for your time and patience in reviewing our manuscript entitled " Development of a prognostic prediction model based on microRNA-1269a in esophageal cancer" (Manuscript NO.: 65626). It is valuable and helpful for your comments on improving the quality of our manuscript. We revised the manuscript point by point according to your comments. The details can be seen as follows:

Reviewer #1 evaluation

1. This study explored the relationship between miR-1269a and esophageal cancer. The results are very interesting, and well discussed. The limit is also discussed. Before final acceptance, an editing is required, both for the language and the format.

Response 1: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for your advice. The language of our manuscript is edited by Editage company. And we uploaded a language editing certificate by Editage in the part of Non-Native Speakers of English Editing Certificate. Also, we have checked the format of our manuscript according to the requirements for manuscript revision.

Reviewer #2 evaluation

1. Some minor language polishing should be corrected. Such as, at the introduction section, line 5, the "burden" was repeated; the blank are missing between "CRCs,and" at the 3rd paragraph of introduction, line 2, etc. Please proof and editing the manuscript carefully.

Response 1: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for your advice. We have carefully proofed our manuscript and corrected those errors in our revised manuscript.

2. **Data in tables and figures are good. However, the figures are not in high quality, please update the images.**

Response 2: We updated the images in high quality in our revised manuscript.

Reviewer #3 evaluation

1. This is an interesting study, which explored the relationship between miR-1269a and its clinical value, and developed a nomogram to succinctly display this relationship. The methods of this study are reasonable, and the results are very good. After a minor editing, it can be accepted for publication.

Response 1: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for your advice.

Science editor evaluation

1. (1) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (2) The authors did not provide original pictures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (3) The "Article Highlights" section is missing. Please add the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text

Response 1: Thank you for reviewing our manuscript and for your advice. (1) We uploaded the approved grant application form in our resubmission. (2) And We provided the original figure documents using PowerPoint format. (3) Also we added the "Article Highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Thanks for your invaluable suggestions and we shall look forward to hearing from you at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Kaiming Ren