Peer Review File

Comment 1: A lot of the data is not presented in a very clear way. Results and figure legends are sparsely described. Moreover, text in most figures is only readable after substantial magnification.

Reply 1: Thank you very much for your suggestion, we have added some explanations to make our article easier for the readers to understand. We update some of results and figure legends. Meanwhile, we have enlarged the text in the figure.

Changes in the text: Page 7, line 181-182; Page 7, line 199-200; Page 8, line 201-213; Page 17, line 524

Comment 2: Material and Methods could be described deeper. The mRNA analysis is completely lacking from this section (primers listed later).

Reply 2: Thinks for your advice. We have added some details about the methods. Meanwhile, mRNA analysis has been completed. Our primers can be found in table 1.

Changes in the text: See page 4, line 95-97; page 5, line 119-121; page 5, line 126-130; page 5 line 145-146, page 6 147-148

Comment 3: The whole manuscript would benefit from language editing.

Reply 2: Thinks for your valuable advice, and we have revised this manuscript referred to language editing.

Changes in text: We have modified all the words and grammar in the whole text according to language editing. However, we did not change the "signature" to "signs" as we think the signature may be more suitable in this manuscript as this manuscript mainly describe a prognosis-related model. Finally, we sincerely thank you for your valuable comments.