Peer Review File

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-21-1468

Reviewer A

1. English language of the paper is poor and substantial editing is necessary.

Reply: Thank you very much for your comments on our article. We had premium editing for the manuscript by the AME Editing Service (http://editing.amegroups.cn/), and we added the acknowledgement for its editing work in the "Acknowledgement" section.

Changes in the text: Changes were mainly in the "Acknowledgement" section (page20, line 428-429).

2. Abstract. Please indicate the clinical significance of this research topic in the background part. In the method part, please describe how the TCGA analysis was conducted. In the results part, in addition to P values, please also provide the detailed figures of outcomes such as expression levels. The conclusion part should have comments on the clinical implications of the findings.

Reply: Thanks for your comments.

1. We have revised the background according to the comments (see page 1-2, line 21-25).
2. First, we affirm the reviewer's suggestion to list the detailed figures of the results. However, because this study involves more comparisons between data, if specific values are listed, the article may not be concise and beautiful, so we only retain the p value.
3. We added the analysis method of TCGA (see page 2, line 29) and commented on the clinical significance of the results in the conclusion (see page 3, line 51-52).

Changes in the text: Changes were mainly in the "Abstract" section(page 1-2, line 21-25, page 2, line 29, page 3, line 51-52).

3. Introduction. In this part, the authors emphasized the poor prognosis but they only focused on the molecular mechanism of NSCLC, not the molecular mechanism of poor prognosis in NSCLC. The authors need to further clarify on this. Second, please have a brief review on existing knowledge of the molecular mechanism of NSCLC, comments on the limitations of previous studies, and explain why it is necessary to focus on LncRNA, in particular LINC00511. Third, the authors need to provide insights on the clinical significance of the molecular mechanism of interest.

Reply: Thanks for your comments. This paper is to study the molecular mechanism of poor prognosis of NSCLC. We have changed "molecular mechanism of NSCLC" to " molecular mechanism responsible for the poor prognosis of NSCLC"(see page 3, line 62-63). We briefly reviewed the existing knowledge of the molecular mechanism of non-small cell lung cancer and clarified the clinical significance of linc00511.Many studies have shown that lncRNAs are related to the progress of NSCLC, so it is necessary to further explore the molecular mechanism of lncRNAs in NSCLC.LINC00511 is a newly identified LncRNA. The over expression level of LINC00511 is associated with poor clinical features and poor prognosis of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma, bladder cancer, tongue squamous cell carcinoma and thyroid cancer. Therefore, we speculate that LINC00511 expression will have an impact on the prognosis of NSCLC. This paper might provide new diagnostic marker and therapeutic target for NSCLC (see page 3-4, line 64-67; page 4-5, line 84-93).

Changes in the text: Changes were mainly in the “Introduction” section (page 3, line 62-63; page 3-4, line 64-67; page 4-5, line 84-93).

4. Methodology. Line 87-88, please indicate how the expression levels were compared. A fundamental limitation of the methodology is that the authors can not provide data on the relationship between LINC00511 and the survival outcomes of NSCLC. The authors may consider to provide a flowchart to describe the experimental procedures.

Reply: Many thanks for your comment. We added specific expression level comparison methods (see page 5, line 100-102). According to the reviewer's suggestion, we made a flow chart to describe the experimental process (see Figure 1).

Changes in the text: Changes were mainly in the “Methodology” section (page 5, line 100-103; Figure 1).

5. Statistics. Please specify the normality test of variables to be compared in this study and clearly indicate the comparisons were made between which groups. Please check the $P<0.05$ is two-sided or not.

Reply: Thank you for underlining these deficiencies. This section has been revised and modified according to the suggestions by the reviewers. The variables to be compared in this study conform to the positive distribution through the normality test. At the same time, we also defined the groups to be compared and the two-sided nature of P value (see page 12, line 244-247).

Changes in the text: Changes were mainly in the “Statistics” section (page 12, line 244-247).

Reviewer B

The authors showed a role of LncRNA LINC00511 in NSCLC through well-designed experiments. While I am wondering why H460 cells show slightly different from other cell lines in expression patterns of RNAs, this manuscript is enough to be accepted in this journal.

Reply: Thanks for your high praise, which will be the driving force for us to continue our scientific research. In the future, we will further explore the differences between H460 cells and other cell lines in RNA expression pattern if possible. Thanks again.

Changes in the text: None.