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Author’s response to reviews:

Reviewer reports:

Tan Bibo (Reviewer 1): Author has revised his manuscript according to comments of reviewers.
Thank you very much.

Ilaria Bellezza (Reviewer 2): The MS has been greatly improved. Nevertheless, some points still arise:

1. The decrease in cell viability observed in HUVEC cells suggested that the compound is not selective for glioma cells. This datum should be discussed and the conclusion that SRT 2183 can be a potential new therapeutic strategy should be corrected.
As suggested, we discussed the non-selective effect of SRT2183. In addition, the conclusion that SRT 2183 can be a potential new therapeutic strategy has been corrected as: “the ER stress pathway is involved in SRT2183-mediated growth inhibition in glioma” in both the Abstract section (lines 65-66, page 3) and the Discussion section (lines 356-357, page 17).

2. The little increase in cell viability observed in the presence of PBA should be discussed. It seems that the inhibition of ER stress fails to counteract SRT2183 effects.

The reviewer raised a good point. As we have discussed (Lines 370-372, page 17), the growth inhibition of glioma cells by SRT2183 was partly due to an increased ER stress. Therefore, PBA could not completely reverse the anti-proliferative effect of SRT2183 in glioma cells.

3. The number of repeats for each experiment must be indicated.

As suggested, the number of repeats for each experiment has been included in the revised Figure Legends (lines 547-548, page 24; lines 576-577, page 25; lines 298-599, page 26; lines 612-613, page 26).

4. Figure resolution is still too low

We suspected that the Figure resolution in the PDF form might be low while the original Figures in JPG form might be high. Meanwhile, we raised the resolution from 300 dpi to 600 dpi.