

Dear editor and dear reviewers

Thank you very much for the additional comments and suggestions. We have modified the manuscript according to the comments below.

We hope this is sufficient for the manuscript to be accepted for publication in *World Journal of Gastroenterology*.

On behalf of all the co-authors

Yours sincerely

Wei Yang

Reviewer #1: Interesting and well conducted work. It might open new scenarios in evaluating the efficacy of colon cancer OHP-based therapies. I think it'll be better if you would reduce the too many achronimous, whose significance is often omitted and improve english languagequality.

Reply: Thank you very much for reading the full text patiently and giving valuable suggestions. Based on your suggestions, we have modified and polished the manuscript.

Reviewer #2: 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? yes 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? yes 5 Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? yes 6 Results. Are the research objectives achieved by the experiments used in this study? What are the contributions that the study has made for research progress in this field? 1.Yes 2.The contributions of this study of was evaluate the presences of OIP5-AS1 and the interaction with miR- 137 in the behavior of the coloncancer 7 Discussion. Does the manuscript interpret the findings adequately and appropriately, highlighting the key points concisely, clearly and logically?

Are the findings and their applicability/relevance to the literature stated in a clear and definite manner? Is the discussion accurate and does it discuss the paper's scientific significance and/or relevance to clinical practice sufficiently?

1. Yes 2. Yes 3. Yes 8 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? 1.yes 2.no 9 Biostatistics. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of biostatistics? yes 10 Units. Does the manuscript meet the requirements of use of SI units? yes 11 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? 1.yes 2.NO 12 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? 1.YES 2.YES 13 Research methods and reporting. Authors should have prepared their manuscripts according to manuscript type and the appropriate categories, as follows: (1) CARE Checklist (2013) - Case report; (2) CONSORT 2010 Statement - Clinical Trials study, Prospective study, Randomized Controlled trial, Randomized Clinical trial; (3) PRISMA 2009 Checklist - Evidence-Based Medicine, Systematic review, Meta-Analysis; (4) STROBE Statement - Case Control study, Observational study, Retrospective Cohort study; and (5) The ARRIVE Guidelines - Basic study. Did the author prepare the manuscript according to the appropriate research methods and reporting? YES 14 Ethics statements. For all manuscripts involving human studies and/or animal experiments, author(s) must submit the related formal ethics documents that were reviewed and approved by their local ethical review committee. Did the manuscript meet the requirements of ethics? YES

COMMENTS TO AUTHORS First. (a) This manuscript is interesting and original. They established new hypothesis about treatment and resistance of CC. (b) the author evaluated to relation between miR-137 and OIP5-AS1 and

the resistances of treatment and progression. (c) yes Second.(a) This manuscript is interesting and provide data about CC behavior and resistance treatment (b) the author 8cevaluate the relation between miR-137 and OIP5-AS1 and failure and the success of the treatment. (c) they not proposed new methods in this study . (d) yes (e) yes (f) yes Third. (a) they not studied the relation of OIP5-AS1 and miR-137 in nude mice. And the prognosis need more studies and they need more basic experiments. (b) about new therapies treatment (c) the efficacy of inhibitions of OIP5-AS1 (d) they need more studies, they need basic studies (e) this publication is very interesting because is evaluate the OIP-AS1 participation in CC, and determine its inhibition by miR-137 . Comments to the authors The manuscript is very interesting well documented, and they explain in detail each part of this , the discussion and conclusion are interesting and provide new important information and hypothesis

Reply: Thank you very much for your patient review of the full text and also for you recognition of the manuscript. We have learned a lot from your review, and we will provide more rigorous study in the future.