

Reviewer #1

1- I would suggest to include a flowchart about how studies were selected to this review.

Although the review was not a systematic review, nevertheless we conducted a systematic bibliographic research. A PRISMA flowchart on studies' selection has now been included in the manuscript

2- Please, make the conclusion shorter and more focused on the findings from this study

We shortened the conclusions leaving only the main findings of the review.

Reviewer #2

1- The authors defined sarcopenia using skeletal muscle mass assessed by imaging examination and not evaluation of muscle quality for example using grip strength. This is not true diagnosis as sarcopenia.

We agree that the definition of sarcopenia should include loss of muscle mass and strength. However all but one the studies included in the review, defined sarcopenia as muscle mass alone over muscle strength or physical performance; only the study by Berkel et al also evaluated the quality of muscle by assessing the presence of myosteatosis. We underlined this criticism in the paragraph "Definition of sarcopenia". As a review article we think that we should maintain the definition reported by the authors, even if it is not comprehensive of the correct definition.

2- The title of this article should be revised as "The relation between skeletal muscle volume and prognosis in rectal cancer patients undergoing neoadjuvant therapy".

We changed the title as suggested