Comments:

Major point

The signature model of OS-related AS events was the most important findings of this study. Please explain the methodology in more details in the Materials and Methods (section 2.5). How do you divided the STAD samples into two subtypes (high- and low-risk-score groups). Please show equations and boundaries if available. The result is also needed to be revised; "On the basis of the OS-related AS-event signature model, the STAD samples were clustered into high- and low-risk-score groups (median risk score = 0.87). (Page 7)" needs median risk score in high-risk-score group.

Minor points

1. In Introduction, "(CD44|14986|ES, PPHLN1|21214|AT, RASSF4|11351|ES, KIAA1147|82046|AP, PPP2R5D|76200|ES, LOH12CR1|20507|ES, CDKN3|27569|AP, UBA52|48486|AD, CADPS|65499|AT, SRSF7|53276|RI, and WEE1|14328|AP)" (Page 3) should be deleted, since they are results. In discussion, they appeared again (Page 10).

2. Is "the OS-related DEAS prognostic model" in section 2.6 mistyping?

3. The examples shown in "for example, four types of AS events were detected for IL32, including IL32|33378|RI, ········ ZNF436 (ZNF436|1050|AP, ZNF436|1051|AP, ZNF439|47755|AP, and ZNF439|47756|AP)." (Page 5) could be shown in supplementary tables.

4. "OS-associated AS events" and "OS-related AS events" are used. Any differences?

5. "including the phospholipase D signaling pathway, platelet activation, phosphatidylinositol signaling system, ········, sphingolipid signaling pathway, and RNA transport." (Page 6) can be deleted, since they are shown in Figure 3A.

6. AS of SRSF7 is not indicated in the discussion (Page 10). Is it already reported or novel in STAD?

Responds:

Thank you very much for the helpful reviewer comments and editorial decision. We took all reviewer comments into consideration and revised our manuscript. Each change is marked in red color. The deletion cannot be seen. Enclosed here is the point-by-point response to each reviewer comment.

Respond for major point:

1. We have added the methodology in more details in the Materials and Methods (section 2.5).

2. The result of "On the basis of the OS-related AS-event signature model, the STAD samples were clustered into high- and low-risk-score groups (median risk score = 0.87). (Page 7)"was revised. Here, median risk score was used to clustered samples into high- and low-risk-score groups.

Respond for minor point:

1. Sure, we have deleted those description in the Introduction and Discussion part.

2. Yes. "The OS-related DEAS prognostic model"was revised into "The OS-related AS prognostic model".

3. Yes. All the results in more details were shown in supplementary tables, and supplementary tables were too large. Here, we just showed some important points for an example. We hope it could help readers easily understand what we identified.

4. "OS-associated AS events" and "OS-related AS events" are used. No differences. We have revised it in a solid form.
5. Sure, we have deleted those description in the Page 6.
6. Yes. AS of SRSF7 is not indicated in the discussion (Page 10).   It was already reported or novel in STAD. Thank you for your reminding, we have added the function of SRSF7 in the discussion.