

## Response to reviewer's comments

We are grateful for the excellent comments provided and have responded to them by incorporating the suggestions and amending the manuscript accordingly where possible. We believe that the comment have enabled us to provide an improved manuscript. We respond to the comments as raised in the "conclusion" section of the review.

Conclusion: The following points need to be dealt with:

Comment 1. Chapter: ?CTT colon cancer biology vis a vis human?. Table 1 is unnecessarily complicated and should be revised such that the reader really can see what is compared.

Response to comment 1: We have simplified the table.

Comment 2. All acronymes should be explained in a list. Readers without direct knowledge about the field (colon cancer, metastases, etc) will spend a lot of time to steadily find the meaning of the abbreviations.

Response to comment 2: We have provided the full titles of the acronyms and abbreviations in the table and elsewhere when they are first mentioned.

Comment 3. The review reads well but a few sentences still needs to be corrected or revised. 4. Fig 4: Difficult to see bile canaliculus?

Response to comment3: We have introduced a statement and arrow to show a typically stained bile canaliculus.

Comment 4: Fig 5: To compare A and B the magnifications should have been Equal.

Response to comment 4: We agree with the reviewer but this was taken directed from a published peer-review publication by permission and we would deviate from our agreement to alter it. The low-power view shows in fact that a large volume of the tamarin liver specimen shows no nuclear staining and is likely representative of the entire tamarin liver.

Comment 5: In order to be prepared to read the review about the work of the authors it would be an advantage to put the present last part of the article in front.

Response to comment 5: We have complied with the reviewer's prescient suggestion.