Here are the answers to the thoughtful criticisms of Reviewer #1, Reviewer#2, and Reviewer#3 for the original manuscript.

Reviewer #1:
Comment: Manuscript needs to be thoroughly proofread and edited for English language. There are too many grammatical errors that impair reading of the manuscript.
Answer: We asked for a native speaker to read thoroughly the manuscript and make the necessary changes as suggested.
Comment: Additionally, there are two figures, which are not at all referred in the manuscript.
Answer: We referred both figures in the manuscript as suggested.

Reviewer #2:
Comment: There are problems with sentence structure, verb tense, and clause construction.
Answer: We asked for a native speaker to read thoroughly the manuscript and make the necessary changes as suggested.
Comment: In the part of "Isolation and Characterization of Larynx Cancer Stem like Cells", the authors use "Cancer Stem like Cells", but the authors use "Cancer Stem Cells" in the title. These two concepts are quite different. From the references, there is no sufficient evidence for the existence of CSCs in LSCC.
Answer: We used the term "Cancer Stem Like Cells" both in the title and throughout the text as suggested.
Comment: Most of references' impact factors are between 2~4, seems to be too low. Some results in those articles are suspect. In addition, the authors direct quote other published Reviews. What is the original?
Answer: We replaced the original references, where we cited reviews, as suggested. We have also cited references from high impact journals like Nature, Cancer Research. Since the articles studying larynx cancer are mostly published in journals with impact factors between 2~4, we needed to cite these articles as well. We expect the understanding of the reviewer for this point.
Comment: The authors should use some figures and tables to explain their opinions.
Answer: We prepared a new figure (New Figure 2) to explain our opinions as suggested.
Comment: The authors need to add more of their original insights.
Answer: We added more of our original insights as suggested and indicated as underlined.

Reviewer #3:
Comment: There are many grammatical mistakes that should be corrected. The authors should more carefully proofread the manuscript to make the corrections. Some obvious ones are listed below: "Recent evidences in the last decade has suggested the existence of CSCs..." -> "... have suggested the existence of CSCs..."; "... concerns about relationship between abnormal miRNA expression and chemo-radio resistance of tumor cells has been ..." -> "... concerns about relationship between abnormal miRNA expression and chemo-radio resistance of tumor cells have been...";
Answer: We corrected the mentioned grammatical mistakes and asked for a native speaker to read thoroughly the manuscript and make the necessary changes as suggested.
Comment: Sentence tenses can be unified. For examples, Huang et al. profiled radiation related miRNAs in CD133 positive Hep-2 cells and showed differential expression of 70 miRNAs in radiation treated laryngeal CSCs. These findings points involvement of certain miRNAs in regulation of CSCs in response to radiation therapy (62). However, since both
normal and cancerous tissue specific stem cells share similar expressional and antigenic profiles, it is difficult to target specifically CSCs (71).

**Answer:** We unified the sentence tense throughout the text as suggested.

**Comment:** Some sentences can add the reference. For examples, 1). Li et al investigated the expression of p75 neurotrophin receptor p75NTR (also known as CD271) and its possible functions in LSCC. 2). Chen et al. investigated the proliferation of capacity of CD133 positive Hep-2 cells in association with Glucose transporter 1 (GLUT-1) expression, which is important in aberrant glucose metabolism.

**Answer:** We cited relevant references for the above-mentioned sentences as suggested.