Author's reply to the review report-Reviewer 1

The English was professionally edited as requested by all reviewers.

1. We clarified that the plasma corresponded to a patient with untreated pemphigus vulgaris, and we chose a single well-studied patient seen clinically, serologically and histopathologically, because it is easier to molecularly characterize a single biological sample and there is less possibility than other autoantibodies may produce cross-reaction and influence the results, Section 2.1 Line 88.

2. The results guide in the "figure legends" has been expanded and is easily understandable for any reader.

3. We totally agree with the reviewer about the limitations of the work, however he opens, as he very well cites, new horizons, regarding downstream markers that mediate the adhesion of keratinocytes in pemphigus.

4. In material and methods, the experiment was repeated at 90% confluence as suggested by the reviewer and the density text of $5X10^5$-$2X10^6$ was replaced by... at 90% per well, and a new set of photos where you can see the in supplementary figure 2.

5. The suggestion to refer in Figure 2 as part a and b was appropriately noted in lines 96 and 98.

6. In relation to the abbreviation N-IgG that was not introduced properly, it is noted at the beginning of the results as Normal IgG instead of Control IgG.

7. The reason for including Camptothecin (CPT) in Figure 3 and throughout the manuscript this Topoisomerase I inhibitor was included as an apoptosis control and is noted in section 2.3, line 124.

8. According to your suggestion green signal was removed. Section 4.10.

10, References were placed at the end of the corresponding paragraph.

11.IFI is IIF.

13. Material and methods All commercial products mention their country of origin.

12. A letter of consent signed by all participants who have reviewed and addressed the suggestions made by the reviewers is attached.

13.The patient was informed and signed his knowledge of participating in the study. Lines 278, 279 and 439, 440.

13. Suplementary figures were properly labeled

14. Indirect immunofluorescence was repeated in monkey esophagus instead of cow nose as suggested by the reviewer and Figure 1b was replaced.

Thank you very much in advance for the suggestions that were taken into account in their entirety, the revised manuscript is ready to be re-evaluated.