

## Peer Review File

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-23-1866>

### Reviewer A

“The article is a clearly written editorial commentary with an interesting point of view about the potential role of HuR inhibition in cancer therapy. Authors were inspired by Finan et al. review, but they provide a different perspective after evaluating the data of HuR in radiotherapy.”

#### 1. Reviewer Comment:

“I would only suggest modifying “expression” by “localization” in the sentence “[...] that cytoplasmatic HuR expression promotes tumorigenesis [...]” (line 46).”

Reply: Thank you, we have clarified the phrase as suggested.

Changes: “Expression” was exchanged for “localization” in line 46.

#### 2. Reviewer Comment

“Moreover, additional recent reviews should be considered to be cited. For instance, the one published in *Cancers* (2022) 14:2666.”

Reply: Thank you. There is a variety of reviews discussing HuR function in cancer and we have now cited more reviews.

Changes: We have modified the third paragraph to reflect other reviews on HuR protein function in cancer.

## **Reviewer B**

“This is a nice-written and interesting-to-read mini-review on a critical topic that I recommend for publication after the authors address a few minor issues.”

### **1. Reviewer Comment**

“Line37: add "cellular" processes”

Reply: The phrase was clarified as suggested.

Changes: Line37 was changed as suggested.

### **2. Reviewer Comment**

“Lines 37, 39, 40: to avoid repeating "broad" maybe "wide range" in line #39, and remove "wide" from line #40 (...in a variety of ...)”

Reply: This is an elegant way to avoid word repetition. Thank you for this suggestion.

Changes: Changes were performed as suggested.

### **3. Reviewer Comment**

“Line 43: Double-check the reference and indicate what kind of splices. There are ~1,300 RBPs in humans and about 1,900 in mice but that is interactome. The number of annotated RBPs is much smaller”

Reply: We have changed the wording to only focus on those in humans (“more than 1200”) as they are the most relevant in this setting.

Changes: The wording was changed as noted.

### **4. Reviewer Comment**

“Line103: suggestion - have to be resolved instead of "met"?”

Reply: Thank you for this thought. We have changed the wording as suggested.

Changes: Wording changed.

### **5. Reviewer Comment**

“Line105: add what kind of outcomes (positive?)”

Reply: Outcomes could include treatment tolerance and quality of life. We have clarified the wording to reflect these outcomes.

Changes: Wording was clarified.

### **6. Reviewer Comment**

“Throughout your review, please specify what type of cancer(s) you refer to, at least to solid or liquid tumors, or both.”

Reply: In the introductory parts of the manuscript, we refer to cancer in general. We have now more clearly defined the exact cancer model used by the papers we cite. No data exist on hematologic malignancies.

Changes: The text was modified to more closely note the type of cancer investigated.

### **7. Reviewer Comment**

“Authors may consider adding the following review to references: "A brave new world of RNA-binding proteins" <https://www.nature.com/articles/nrm.2017.130>”

Reply: Thank you for this suggestion. We have incorporated the review in the introductory section.

Changes: We have added the high-profile review noted above as citation (4).