

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Radiomics of Rectal Cancer for Predicting Distant Metastasis and Overall Survival" (ID: 56842). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. Revised portion are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer's comments are as flowing:

1. For Editors' comments:(1) The highest single-source similarity index in the CrossCheck report showed to be 5%. According to our policy, the overall similarity index should be less than 30%, and the single-source similarity should be less than 5%. Please rephrase these repeated sentences

Response: We rephrased Introduction and part of Methods. Then, the revised manuscript was sent to a company for editing grammar.



(2) 5 Issues raised: (1) I found the title was more than 12 words. The title should be no more than 12 words; (2) I found no "Author contribution" section. Please provide the author contributions; (3) I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor; and (4) I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Response: All these issues have been solved.

2.Responds to the reviewer's comments:

Reviewer #1:

1. Response to comment: ( Can the authors demonstrate actual rate (%) of distant metastasis and overall survival, correlating your radiomics features? And if that is possible, please make correlating tables and show results in the abstract too. It will be good helps for clinical practice. )

Response: We've added information about rates of distant metastasis and overall survival. The comparisons of the models were done between the metastasis group and non-metastasis group, and between the death group and survival group. As shown in Table 2 and abstract.

2. Response to comment: (On the 2nd paragraph of discussion, authors discussed about previous study regarding radiomics. I suggest authors to write more about the result and interpretation of previous literature, regarding radiomics and rectal cancer, and similiarity and difference with your study.)

Response: We have added some content about the similarities and differences with the previous research.