

Revision Explanation

1. Reviewer #1: Conclusion was that these two markers could be used as potential indicators for recurrence and prognosis in patients with glioma after surgery. The study is a well-written, good structured recommendation for the diagnosis of glioma, with good recommendations for clinical use. Also, your article is good in grammar and scientific writing rules. The topic is actual and well described.

Explanation: Thank you very much for your recognition of our work and research.

2. Reviewer #2:

(1) In the Abstract, a small introduction about background is required.

Explanation: We have added a brief introduction about background in the Abstract.

(2) Why did the control group use 60 healthy subjects instead of 91 as the experimental group? If the same number of subjects in the two groups is equal, there may be a better comparison.

Explanation: Due to the little number of glioma cases, the sample size of our study was determined according to the time sequence, at the same time 60 healthy volunteers were recruited.

(3) The format of references should be modified.

Explanation: The reference format has been revised according to the requirements of the *World Journal of Clinical Cases*.

3. (1) Running title: Abbreviations are permitted. Also, please shorten the running title to no more than 6 words.

(2) Core Tip: Abbreviations must be defined upon first appearance in the Core Tip.

(3) Article Highlights: Abbreviations must be defined upon first appearance in the Article Highlights.

(4) Footnotes and Figure Legends

Explanation: We have written and added the running title, core tip, article highlights and footnote.

4. Title: The title should be no more than 18 words

Explanation: After the modification, the title of our paper has been no more than 18

words.