

Dear Editor:

Thank you very much for your comments for our manuscript entitled “Knockdown of DDX51 inhibited tumor growth of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma via PI3K/AKT pathway”. The reviewers’ comments are very helpful for revising and improving our paper. We carefully revised our manuscript according to the reviewers’ comments point by point. Please find attached reply to comments.

We state that the material is original research, has not been previously published and has not been submitted for publication elsewhere while under consideration. No conflict of interest exists in the submission of this manuscript, and manuscript is approved by all authors for publication.

Thanks for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Ming-Yan Zhang

(1) Science editor:

This manuscript showed the expression of DDX51 in ESCC tumor tissues and adjacent normal tissues detected by Immunohistochemistry (IHC) analysis and quantitative real-time PCR (qRT-PCR). The author knocked down DDX51 in ESCC cell lines by using a siRNA transfection to investigate whether DDX51 affects the biological behavior of ESCC. The article is robust, readable, and introduces a potential breakthrough in understanding ESCC pathophysiology and a therapeutic target.

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing) Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments. We revised the manuscript according to the comment.

(2) Company editor-in-chief:

I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, and the relevant ethics documents, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Gastroenterology, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office's comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors. Please provide decomposable Figures (in which all components are movable and editable), organize them into a single PowerPoint file.

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments. We revised the manuscript according to the comment.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing) Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: Very interesting work. Well conducted study, clearly exposed. Important results to be taken into account in clinical practice. Relevant discussion. Updated bibliography.

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing) Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: Thank you for the invitation to review the manuscript titled, "Knockdown of DDX51 inhibited tumor growth of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma via PI3K/ AKT pathway." The authors investigated the effect of DDX51 on

the behavior of esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC). The results suggest that DDX51 assists malignancy proliferation. Moreover, DDX51 knockdown inhibited ESCC proliferation and aided programmed cell death. The article is robust, readable, and introduces a potential breakthrough in understanding ESCC pathophysiology and a therapeutic target. The paper also presents knowledge that was previously only studied in lung and breast cancer. I suggest ACCEPTANCE for publication after a few MINOR REVISIONS below.

A. Introduction

1. The last two sentences of the introduction section discuss the results of the present study. Authors might need to place these sentences in the discussion section and not in the introduction section.

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments. We removed the sentences from introduction according to the comment in the revised manuscript.

B. Statistical analysis

2. Authors stated that they used a student's t-test and one-way analysis of variance (i.e., parametric tests). Was the normality test done? Depending on the normality, statistical tests might change (parametric versus non-parametric tests). Can authors justify that all data satisfied parametric tests' assumptions? [Note: A single brief statement will address this comment].

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments. We added the related description according to the comment in the revised manuscript.

C. Typos

3. The AIM statement in the ABSTRACT: There are double spaces between "biological" and "behavior." Kindly delete one space.

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments. Sincerely sorry about the mistake and we corrected it in the revised manuscript.

4. The CONCLUSION statement of the ABSTRACT: Kindly add an "s" after the

word "suggest." (i.e., a simple present tense)

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments. Sincerely sorry about the mistake and we corrected it in the revised manuscript.

5. RESULTS: The last sentence of the section titled "DDX51 was highly expressed in ESCC tumor tissues and associated a poor prognosis in ESCC patients:" Did authors mean " these results" instead of "theses results?"

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments. Sincerely sorry about the mistake and we corrected it in the revised manuscript.

Reviewer #3:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good) Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing) Conclusion: Accept (High priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This research work is good and very interesting. This work is technically sound. The statistical approach is optimal for this data set. This work has been tailored with available literature. I appreciate your work.

Response: Thank you for your professional and constructive comments.