

## Review of: "Vimentin Regulates Collagen Remodeling Through Interaction with Myosin 10"

susinjan bhattacharya

**Potential competing interests:** The author(s) declared that no potential competing interests exist.

The work is not only interesting but also a good work. I recommend acceptance of the manuscript.

However, with regard to the work focus, i have certain queries and wish the author(s) to answer it either by adding data, or else cite reasons for the non-addition of data in the manuscript.

1. It is good to look at utilization of Vim expression, but additionally why levels of other EMT transcription factors have not been studied (in terms of up-regulation or down-regulation? Other than vimentin, why studies for levels of fibronectin and N-cadherin has not been taken up? Levels of the other EMT markers would have further strengthened the work (i am quoting two reference papers here: [https://www.nature.com/articles/s41556-018-0196-y#:~:text=EMT%20is%20largely%20mediated%20by,1\)..](https://www.nature.com/articles/s41556-018-0196-y#:~:text=EMT%20is%20largely%20mediated%20by,1)..)  
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6071152/#:~:text=During%20the%20process%20of%20EMT,molecular%20alterations%20representing%20mesenchymal%20differentiation.&text=Thi>
2. Experiments with Myo10 is alright. But would not it have been better as an additional experiment for depletion of capping protein to demonstrate explosive formation of filopodia? ( you can have a look at the Marisan R. Mejillano et al., Cell, Vol. 118, 363–373, August 6, 2004 paper)
3. Experiments with Arp 2 / 3 complex would have further strengthened the present work (i am citing work of Georgi Dimchev et al., in MBoC Volume 28, 2017 , (<http://www.molbiolcell.org/cgi/doi/10.1091/mbc.E16-05-0334>).