

Comments. Manuscript 55375:

Reviewer#05106340

Comments #05106340

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

In this manuscript, the authors aimed to explore the scenario of CTCs' behavior in tumor (T) and blood in eighteen patients with brain tumors by assessing protein expression . The article is interesting. However, there are still some problems need to be resolved, as detailed below. 1. It is not easy to understand article results and abstract results. the writing of this article should be improved. the key data in this article should be showed in abstract results.. 2. CTC is very rare in the blood, accounting for only about one billionth of the total PBMCs. How did the author judge the protein expression on CTC without cell purification?

Answer to comments #05106340

Comment 1.

It is not easy to understand article results and abstract results. the writing of this article should be improved. the key data in this article should be showed in abstract results.

Response to comment 1.

The revised Result section for abstract is inserted in the Results section of abstract in page 4.

Comment 2.

CTC is very rare in the blood, accounting for only about one billionth of the total PBMCs. How did the author judge the protein expression on CTC without cell purification?

“planning”? 4.The number of specimens selected is relatively small, which can not accurately represent the individual, and can not accurately reflect the general characteristics of the population. You should collect as much information as possible. 5.The contents of ‘MATERIALS AND METHODS’ are a little too concise. In "Analytical strategy", we should explain in more detail how data analysis is carried out.In “The experimental methods”,the experimental method needs further explanation. 6.In the sixth paragraph of the “RESULT”,you should give a brief introduction to how the data in the table are obtained. Overall, I think this article has certain innovation, but there are also some problems that need improvement. I think this article needs to be reviewed again after revision.

Dear reviewer: Thanks for devoting your time to review our manuscript and your valuable comments are highly appreciated.

****The revised items are highlighted as Yellow.**

Comment 1: In the second paragraph of the “RESULT”,should the word “ by” be removed?

Response to comment 1: the word “ by” is removed.

Comment 2: On page 3, line 7, the name of the person is misplaced.

Response to comment 2: Sorry, I could not find it.

Comment 3: On page 3, line 14, should the word “plan”be replaced by “planning”?

Response to comment 3. In core tips, the word plan is replaced by planning.

Comment 4:The number of specimens selected is relatively small, which can not accurately represent the individual, and cannot accurately reflect the general characteristics of the population. You should collect as much information as possible.

Response to comment 4:

As the number of analyzed cells played the key role in this single cell- based research, the focal population is considered as the total cell numbers, through which the course of evolution could be explored by unmasking the heterogeneity and diverse pattern of protein expression in the single cells.

The text in materials and methods (page 7/1st paragraph) is revised.

Comment 5: The contents of ‘MATERIALS AND METHODS’ are a little too concise. In "Analytical strategy", we should explain in more detail how data analysis is carried out. In “The experimental methods”, the experimental method needs further explanation.

Response to comment 5:

The required texts are inserted within the page 7. The full Information is provided in the legends of Figures 1 and 2 (page 23)

Comment 6. In the sixth paragraph of the “RESULT”, you should give a brief introduction to how the data in the table are obtained.

Response to comment 6:

A highlighted text is inserted in the 1st paragraph of result (page9).

