

Dear Editor,

Thanks for providing us with this great opportunity to submit a revised version of our manuscript. We appreciate the detailed and constructive comments provided by the reviewers. We have carefully revised the manuscript by incorporating all the suggestions by the review panel. **The revised/added contents have been highlighted with yellow color in the revised manuscript.**

We hope this revised manuscript has addressed your concerns, and look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely,

Xin Lin

### **Encl. Responses to the comments from Reviewers.**

Reviewer #1:

**Scientific Quality:** Grade C (Good)

**Language Quality:** Grade B (Minor language polishing)

**Conclusion:** Major revision

**Specific Comments to Authors:** In this submitted manuscript, Lin et al. found the highly expressed scindrin in glioma and its therapeutic potential for glioma treatment. However, some important data were missing or lack in the current version. I suggest the author make a major revision before submitting back again.

1. The supporting figure(s) are missing, for example Figure S1 (Line 172).

**Response: Thank you for pointing this out. The Figure S1 has been supplemented.**

2. The author only compared the mRNA expression difference of SCIN. How about the SCIN protein level between glioma and normal tissue?

**Response:** The expression of SCIN protein level in glioma and normal tissues have been supplemented in the Figure 1B.

3. When knockdown a gene two different shRNA at least should be involved, but the author only used one.

**Response:** Thank you for this suggestion. We actually designed and constructed three shRNAs targeting SCIN. Western Blot and CCK8 experiments confirmed that the sh-SCIN#3 used in this study showed the strongest inhibitory effect on SCIN expression. Therefore, we chose it for further experiments. The relevant images have been provided in Figure S1.

4. The author should show the effectiveness and specificity of shRNA in the knockdown of target gene using western blotting.

**Response:** The effectiveness and specificity SCIN shRNAs have been provided in Figure S1A-B.

5. In Figure 3C, the data are not consistent with the conclusion, in which knockdown of SCIN promotes the migration of U87 cells.

**Response:** We were really sorry for our careless mistakes. Thank you for your reminder. We have reviewed the raw experimental data and revised the Figure 3C.

6. The scale bar should be added in Figure 2E, and the length of all the scale bars in the manuscript should be indicated in a clear way.

**Response:** The scale bars have been added in Figure 2F, and the length of all the scale bars has been indicated in the Figure legend.

7. How does SCIN activate the RhoA/FAK axis? Could the author make more investigation or discussion.

**Response:** Thank you for this suggestion. The discussion has been revised.



## JOURNAL EDITORIAL BOARD COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1- The manuscript requires English editing and grammatically revision.

Response: We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes to the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in yellow in the revised paper. We appreciate for Editors' warm work earnestly and hope that the correction will meet with approval.

2- In Materials and Methods section, under the title: Transwell invasion assay  $1 \times 10^3$  transfected cells in 100  $\mu$ L serum-free medium were added to the upper transwell chamber. The number 3 must be superscripted.

Response: We feel sorry for our carelessness. We have corrected it and we also feel great thanks for your point out.

3- In figure 2: there is no indication for Figure 2F.

Response: Thanks for your careful checks. The indication for Figure 2F has been added in Figure 2.