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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Editor and Reviewer,

Firstly thank for your kindly comments of the reviewers because these largely improved its quality. According to the comments, we have made careful point-by-point answer or revision. The points were in detail demonstrated as follows:

As for the comments of Reviewer 1:

Thank for your kindly and favorable comment. I will continue to correct the manuscript carefully for its improvement.

As for the comments of Reviewer 2:

Major comment

1. The data as presented did not provide any clear concluding whether RhoC is required and or involved in VEGF and TGF-β signaling. In fact, the major part of the manuscript suggested that there is minimal connection among them.

Answer: We reconsidered and corrected the conclusion.

2. Figure 1F: Changes in E-cad, N-cad and #-SMA should be shown at the protein and cellular location levels.

Answer: The data about E-cad and N-cad have been presented in Figure 3. Sorry not to present the data in different places. The immunofluorescence of #-SMA was not so good so as not to be provided in the manuscript.

3. The text and the contents of Fig. 2 did not match. For example, Figure 2B did not show the effects of VEGF and TGF-β on proliferation as described in text. The current Figure 2B might be Figure 2C and 2D, but the data are not quantitative to support the descriptions in text. Other panels do not match as
Answer: Sorry for the mislabeling of the figures. We have carefully revised them.

4. More importantly, data presented in Figure 2 and 3 basically so that there was a minimal connection among RhoC and VEGF or TGF-β.

Answer: Sorry for it. We reconcluded these findings in combination of our data and literature.

5. Yet the authors conclude that “These suggested that VEGF and TGF-β might promote the migration and invasion of ovarian carcinoma cells via RhoC, which is closely linked to EMT.” (in discussion).

Answer: We have changed the conclusion according to your suggestion.

6. In introduction, the concepts need to be more accurately presented.

Answer: The concepts have been reconsidered and reorganized accurately according to your suggestion.

7. The English needs to be significantly improved.

Answer: Sorry for the poor description. We invited an English-speaker to check the English.

As for the comments of Reviewer 3:

Major comment

1. Figure 1E: Quantify spherical/enlongated cells: standard commercially available software for automated unbiased counting, rather than “representative images”

Answer: I am sorry that we cannot get the software immediately. Therefore, we are forced to use these representative figures.

2. Figure 1F: Should be supplemented with Western blot. Some data in Figure 3A, see comment there.

Answer: The data are presented in Figure 3A. We think that the duplicate presentation is not so good. Sorry#

3. Figure 2A: Provide data, at the very least with relevant maximal dose of growth factor and inhibitor after RhoC siRNA, mock siRNA, RhoC vector transfection and mock vector transfection Figure 2B: same comment as in Figure 2E.

Answer: We added the data in Figure 2A, 2B, 2E according to your suggestion. Additionally, we are sorry not to provide the mock data because of too many figures for the manuscripts.

4. Figure 2C, D: statistical comparison of which group have been made. Asterisk suggests only comparison without inhibitor or without growth factor? If not, as it appears to be, what is their role then?