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REVIEWER COMMENTS FOR THE AUTHOR:
Reviewer:
In this present study, authors demonstrate that Circ-SMARCA5 is correlated with better prognosis of MM, and it inhibits cell proliferation and promotes cell apoptosis via sponging miR-767-5p. The finding is interesting and need to explore more to provide us solid evidences of Circ-SMARCA5 function and mechanisms involved in pathogenesis of myeloma.

Major comments:

1. The data need to be well reorganized and make them more clear which will be easier for reader to follow. The language should be written in a simple and declarative way and texts need to be more concise.

2. Figure 3. The cutoff value of Circ-SMARCA5 is not clear in Figure 2 and Figure 3. And how many patients in high and low level group are not clear as well.

3. It is not clear about the control cells used in this study. Such as Figure 4. Authors compare wild types with resistant cells of MM cell lines to compare the differential expression of Circ-SMARCA5, otherwise bortezomib sensitive and resistant cell lines.

4. Figure 5. Which kind of cell was used in this experiment? How to explain there are significantly decreased expression of Circ-SMARCA5 in Circ (-) group compared with NC (-) group?

5. Figure 6. A did not show the proliferation inhibition in overexpression Circ-SMARCA5, but B shows increased apoptosis of those cells. How to explain the un-consistent result?

6. Figure 7. It is weird that the level of Mir-767-5p is significantly upregulated in Circ (-) group than NC (-) group. How to explain the results?
7. All of the detection of Circ-SMARCA5 and Mir-767-5p are performed on the MM cell lines. Authors should detect the level of primary patient samples to validate this finding.

8. The authors show provide some clinical evidence whether the high level of Circ-SMARCA5 in MM cells is more sensitive to the clinical treatment?

Minor comments:

A. Check spelling, words and grammar throughout document. For example,

B. It is strongly suggested that the title should not be a so long sentence with punctuations. It should be shortened and become much clear and concise.

C. Do not to start a sentence with numbers or lowercases, for instance, Methods CCK8 10 ul, qPCR in measurement of Circ-SMARCA5 in MM cell …, Results 105 MM.

D. Under Results, I suggest that authors put the Table 1 and 2 to the supplemental data, or you can just transfer them to words and put them in the methods. Because those are not the results for the paper and not necessary to be isolated tables.

E. In Table 4, Immunoglobulin subtypes instead of subtype; cytogenetics abnormalities instead of cytogenetics abnormality. Try to double check the proper use of plural nouns.

F. In Table 5, there are repeated explanations of Hb, Scr, ALB et al compared with Table 4. Similar problems in Table 6.

G. Could you show us the exact numbers of response? CR #, VGPR# and so on.
Are the methods appropriate and well described?
If not, please specify what is required in your comments to the authors.

Yes

Does the work include the necessary controls?
If not, please specify which controls are required in your comments to the authors.

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.

No

Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.

I am able to assess the statistics

Quality of written English
Please indicate the quality of language in the manuscript:

Needs some language corrections before being published
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