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Dear Editors,

We enclose a manuscript entitled “Elevated C1orf63 expression is correlated with CDK10 and predicts better outcome for advanced breast cancers: a retrospective study” for publication in *BMC Cancer*. The main text includes 26 pages, 7 tables, and 3 figures prepared according to the journal's Instructions to Authors.

As far as we know, C1orf63 has been seldomly studied in breast cancer. Our paper primarily investigated the expression and clinical implication of C1orf63 in breast cancer, and the results indicated the bipolar characters of C1orf63 in the progression of breast cancer. Since elevated expression was observed in tumors, C1orf63 might contribute to breast cancer oncogenesis. However, C1orf63 predicted better prognosis for advanced TNM stage breast cancers, and was correlated with the cell cycle-dependent gene, CDK10.

We promise that the content has not been published or submitted for publication elsewhere, and all the authors listed have contributed significantly and are in agreement with the submission of the manuscript. No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed.

We respectfully submit four potential suitable peer reviewers based on their expertise in the field:

**Magdalena Chechlinska**, Department of Immunology, Maria Sklodowska-Curie Memorial Cancer Centre and Institute of Oncology, Warsaw, Poland.

E-mail: chech@coi.waw.pl

**Dietmar Pils**, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Molecular Oncology Group, Medical University of Vienna, European Union, Vienna, Austria.

E-mail: dietmar.pils@univie.ac.at

**Yunfu Cui**, Department of Hepatopancreatobiliary Surgery, Second Affiliated Hospital of Harbin Medical University, Harbin, China.

E-mail: yfcui777@hotmail.com

**Martin Filipits**, Institute of Cancer Research, Department of Medicine I, Medical University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.

E-mail: martin.filipits@meduniwien.ac.at

Thank you very much for your attention and consideration. We are looking forward to your response.

Kind regards.

Sincerely

Cui Yukun

Email: yukuncui@yahoo.com
Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for your email about formatting changes of our manuscript (MS: 1721337834153728). Your suggestion is really appreciated. We carefully check and clearly followed the advice of your email.

Our revised manuscript includes:

1. Supplemental Figure 1 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Figure 2 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.
   Reply:
   We have change Supplemental Figure 1 to Figure 2. (Page 8, line 19 & Page 19)

2. Supplemental Table 1 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Table 2 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.
   Reply:
   We have change Supplemental Table 1 to Table 2. (Page 7, line 17; Page 11, line 9 & Page 21)

3. Supplemental Table 2 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Table 3 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.
   Reply:
   We have change Supplemental Table 2 to Table 3. (Page 8, line 12 & Page 22)

4. Supplemental Table 3 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Table 4 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.
   Reply:
   We have change Supplemental Table 3 to Table 4. (Page 9, line 9, 18 & Page 23)

5. Table 2 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Table 5 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.
   Reply:
   We have change Table 2 to Table 5. (Page 9, line 13, 19; Page 10, line 3 & Page 24)

6. Table 3 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Table 6 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.
   Reply:
   We have change Table 3 to Table 6. (Page 10, line 6 & Page 25)

7. Table 4 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Table 7 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.
8. Supplemental Figure 2 in the current version of the manuscript submission should be changed to Figure 3 in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission.

Reply:
We have changed Supplemental Figure 2 to Figure 3. (Page 11, line 8 & Page 19)

9. ALL 7 TABLE in the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission should be shown consecutively listed (as Table 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7) in the Table section within the appropriate position at the end of the text of the Microsoft Word file itself of the revised version of the manuscript submission. NO TABLES should be uploaded as supplemental files.

Reply:
All 7 tables are consecutively listed now, and no tables are uploaded as supplemental files.

10. ALL 3 FIGURES for the recommended revised version of the manuscript submission should ONLY BE UPLOADED as 3 separate FIGURES (separate from the uploading of the Microsoft Word file itself), and NO FIGURES should be included within the text of the Microsoft Word file itself of the revised version of the manuscript submission. Likewise, NO FIGURES should be uploaded as supplemental files.

Reply:
All 3 figures are uploaded as 3 separate figures, and no figures are uploaded as supplemental files.

11. PLEASE re-check and correct the placement of “(A)”, “(B)”, “(C)”, and “(D)” within the Figure Legend of Figure 1 to make the next easier to follow, as I believe that “(B)” and “(C)” are both currently mis-placed, and “(C)” is currently mis-shown as “C)” instead of as “(C)”.

Consider re-writing the Figure Legend of Figure 1 as follows: “Figure 1 - C1orf63 and CDK10 expression in human breast tissues. (A) IHC detected strong staining of C1orf63 in tumors (i, original magnification 400×), moderate staining of C1orf63 in tumors (ii, 400×), weak staining of C1orf63 in tumors (iii, 400×), and absent staining for C1orf63 in adjacent normal tissues (iv, 400×); (B) Kaplan-Meier survival analyses (log-rank test) of C1orf63 expression in all the breast cancer patients; (C) Kaplan-Meier survival analyses (log-rank test) of C1orf63 expression in breast cancer patients in advanced TNM stage (TNM III/IV stage); (D) IHC also detected staining of CDK10 in tumors (i) and absent staining for CDK10 in tumors (ii).”.

Reply:
The placement of “(A)”, “(B)”, “(C)”, and “(D)” within the Figure Legend of Figure 1 have been corrected and the Figure legend of Figure 1 are re-written following your suggestion.
If anything has to be adjusted further, please don't hesitate to contact us. Thank you very much.

Kind regards.
Sincerely
Cui Yukun
Email: yukuncui@yahoo.com
Zhang Fan
Email: lemon_fan@163.com