

Number ID	Review Info	Specific Comments To Authors	Specific Comments To Authors (File)
05085948	Conclusion: Rejection Scientific Quality: Grade E (Do not publish) Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)	The argoument is interesting but too many concepts are introduced and not completely analysed. I think the Authors should focus theyr attention on a specific field (i.e. learning curve, sentinel node mapping, anastomotic vascularization...) so that it'll be better discussed relatively to robotic surgery.	
02929648	Conclusion: Minor revision Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good) Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)	Good editorial.	
02445561	Conclusion: Accept (High priority) Scientific Quality: Grade A (Excellent) Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)	A very well framed article relevent to contemporary surgery - the article is informative, logical and well structured.	
02509032	Conclusion: Accept (General priority) Scientific Quality: Grade D (Fair) Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)	well written synopsis on the role of the intuitive robot for colorectal cancer.	

1. In order to address concerns expressed by reviewer #05085948, we have clarified at the beginning of the editorial that this is not a review article, but rather an editorial that is attempting to highlight many of the recent areas of study and investigation related to robotic colorectal surgery. We did not feel narrowing the topics would serve that goal, but certainly wanted to address the concerns of the reviewer who expressed “too many concepts introduced and not completely analyzed”. As such, we have provided much more detail from many of the studies cited. We have highlighted these areas in **red lettering**. Although we recognize this editorial does not “completely analyze” any of the topics, again our goal is to raise awareness of areas that are being explored, and suggest further areas of study. We hope the higher level of detail we have provided satisfies the concerns of the reviewer. The other three reviewers expressed agreement with the relevance and structure of the editorial.
2. We have made edits throughout the editorial to address “minor language polishing” suggested by reviewers #02509032, 02929648, and 05085948.

Answering editor in chief: Figure 1, showing use of ICG and infrared light to evaluate bowel perfusion. The manuscript with “(Figure 1)” added in an appropriate place.