



DREXEL UNIVERSITY

College of

Medicine

*Department of Microbiology & Immunology*

**Pamela Norton, Ph.D.**

*Associate Professor of Microbiology and Immunology  
Co-Director, Program in Molecular Medicine*

4/26/2019

To the Editors,

Thank you for the interest in our manuscript WJG 47404. We have attempted to respond to the comments provided by the reviewers and the Science Editor. Changes to the manuscript text are highlighted in yellow. These include the addition of a Running title, ORCID IDs, the Authors contributions, Telephone contact (no Fax) and the Article Highlights section. We have also recorded a Core Tip. The “Supported by” section was removed, as we were unclear on the documentation requested.

Detailed responses to each reviewer’s comments are on the following page. In responding to one of the reviewers, we subdivided the Results section. We accordingly divided former Figure 3 into new Figures 3, 4 and 5. This allows the individual panels to be larger, improving legibility, as well as corresponding to the Results subsections. We have also added several new citations, and reformatted the References, including PMIDs and DOIs when available. In-text citations were reformatted as requested.

While we were able to decompose Figure 1 entirely, the other figures were generated as screen shots, and thus only exist as image files, apart from the Gene Symbol Labels. These labels are editable.

One additional comment: we have used the capitalized Gene symbols throughout the paper, including in Tables and Figures. These are not actually acronyms or abbreviations, and therefore don’t expand in a straightforward way.

Thanks for the many recommendations that have improved the manuscript.

Sincerely,

Pamela Norton, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Microbiology and Immunology  
Co-Director, Master’s Program in Molecular Medicine

## **Responses to reviewers for MS ID#47404**

ID 03647483: "Norton et al's study focused on the expression of genes that control core fucosylation in hepatocellular carcinoma. They performed a PubMed biomedical literature and systematic review and conducted a TCGA data mining based on six genes (FPGT, FUK, FUT8, GMDS, SLC35C1, TSTA3) known to be involved in the attachment of core fucosylation, the synthesis of the fucosylation substrate GDP-fucose, or the transport of the substrate into the Golgi might offer mechanistic insight into the regulation of core fucose levels. Finally, they found that amplification of the genes involved in the de novo pathway for generation of GDP-fucose, GMDS, and TSTA3, is a likely contributor to the elevated core fucose observed in hepatocellular carcinoma. Generally speaking, the design of the review is very meticulous and novel. Furthermore, the review is of significance in elucidating the molecular mechanism of controlling the production of core fucosylated proteins in hepatocellular carcinoma patients."

**Our response: No comments to address**

ID 02929648: "Good paper, but it is necessary to provide the reference of figures."

**Our response: References add to figure legends as appropriate**

ID 00070109: "In this manuscript, the authors focused on core fucose related genes in HCC. The authors performed a review of the literature and related bioinformatic review to address this issue. The language is well presented and the manuscript is well organized. I just suggest the authors can renew some of the citations. Besides, in page 4 line 7, it is supposed to be expressed as "associated with"."

**Our response: A number of newer citations have been added, such as references 14, 49-51 and 53. The language cited on p. 4 has been corrected.**

ID 02445571: "In this paper, the author reviewed the six genes expression that involved in core fucosylation of hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). The author concluded that GDP-fucose, GMDS, and TSTA3 were contributor to the elevation of core fucose in the HCC. The information which the author reviewed regarding the glycometabolism, in particular core fucosylation, in HCC development is a new area and raising more attention recent years. Therefore, this work is meaningful and will draw more reader's attention. The weak point is the result sections, the data described less concentration and logically unclear, needs to be well organized. The references also need to be updated."

**Our response: The Results section has been divided into additional subsections and the text altered in an attempt to better clarify our results. Accordingly, original Figure 3, which was quite crowded with six panels, has been divided into Figs. 3-5, with each corresponding to one subsection of the Results. Reference updating is described above.**

**We thank all reviewers for their comments.**