Answering Reviewers

Dear editor and reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers' comments on our manuscript entitled " A prognostic model of melanoma patients based on autophagy Long non-coding ribonucleic acids" (Manuscript NO：70649). Those comments are very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to other research. We have studied the comments carefully and made corrections which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections are in the manuscript and the responds to the reviewers' comments are as follows (the replies are highlighted in blue).

Replies to the reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. question:

in Table 3, the prognostic melanoma risk model based on multivariate Cox proportional hazards analysis. It would be very interesting, if the author can validate these data in NCBI GEO or other databases for these 15 lncRNAs including LINC01943, AC090948.3, USP30-AS1, AC068282.1, AC004687.1, AL133371.2, AC242842.1, PCED1B-AS1, HLA-DQB1-AS1, AC011374.2, LINC00324, and ITGB2-AS1.

Response：

In order to verify the accuracy and stability of our risk model, we downloaded three melanoma-related data sets (GSE65904, GSE19234, and GSE78220) from the GEO database, a total of 265 melanoma samples, and performed model survival on them Analysis, risk curve, scatter plot and heat map analysis, the analysis results are basically consistent with the results of

the TCGA database. In addition, we also conducted single-factor and multi-factor COX analysis and ROC analysis on the GSE78220 data set. Results showed that the hazard ratio (HR) was 1.272 in the univariate analysis and 1.350 in the multivariate. Additionally, the risk score 95% confidence interval was 1.138-1.422 ($p < 0.001$) and 1.186- 1.536 ($p < 0.001$) in the univariate and multivariate analyses, respectively. This shows that the most important prognostic factor of melanoma is not age, gender or TMN staging, but the risk model score, and the results are consistent with the results of the TCGA database analysis. The results of the analysis It has been written into the manuscript, and the corresponding pictures have also been uploaded to the "70649-Figures.ppt" file.

2. question:

The font is too small in most figures, and the manuscript needs English proofreading.

Response:

Regarding the problem that the font of the figures is too small, we have re-created the figures and uploaded it to "70649-Figures.ppt" and re-proofed the manuscript. The relevant proof has been uploaded to "70649-Non-Native Speakers of English Editing" Certificate ".

Kind regards,

Yue Qiu

E-mail: 492145902@qq.com

Corresponding author : Jun Yao

E-mail address: yaojun800524@126.com