

Dear editor,

We would like to thank the reviewer for careful and thorough reading of this manuscript and for the thoughtful comments and constructive suggestions, which help to improve the quality of this manuscript. Our response follows (the reviewer's comments are in red).

Reviewer #1: this work is interesting, but some comments are highlighted below: 1- the sample size is small, so results cannot be generalized. 2- the study is exploratory and not confirmatory, so authors cannot generalize their results. meta-analyses and systematic reviews are needed to clarify this issue. 3- is this marker repeated after surgery or it is done once before the operative procedure.

Thanks for your review and comments. We reply to your questions as follows. 1. The sample size in this study is small indeed. We have explained it in the discussion section, and have provided our solution to it, but we really appreciate your suggestion. 2. Our study is an exploratory research indeed. We will carry out cohort study and randomized controlled study in the future to improve our research results. 3. We collected and tested samples before and after surgical treatment. Thank you again for your comments on our article.

Reviewer #2: The authors proved the concept that micro-RNA 1304 has a role in predicting the prognosis of esophageal squamous carcinoma. The results are robust with good AUC no matter what in relation with size, LN metastasis, staging, recurrence and prognosis. Besides, the peer review process requires 14 to 28 days or longer for each manuscript. Usually, our first decision regarding the pre-acceptance or rejection of a manuscript is based on the comments of one to three reviewers. We will hold a meeting each week to make the first decision of manuscripts. Once the first decision of your manuscript is made, we will notify you immediately by e-mail.

Thank you very much for your comments on our research. We will continue to improve our research results.

Sincerely,
Guo-Min Liu