Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[Y] Yes [ ] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Thank you very much for asking me to review this manuscript by Jun Luo et al. This is a retrospective study to identify risk factors for colorectal cancer relapse after laparoscopic radical resection by comparing the baseline data and laboratory indicators of 140 CRC patients, of which 30 relapsed within three years. The result of the study is of interest. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. It might help reduce the risk of disease recurrence and improve patient outcomes. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed: 1. Title: Proper and cover all the core result from the study. 2. Abstract: Address all of the important component from the study. However, the background section needs to be more concise. 3. Key words: could cover this study. 4. Introduction: Describe the overall basic knowledge for this study. Moreover, the aim of the study is clear. 5. Method: The present study is methodologically well conducted. 6. Results: The result of this study is of interest. 7. Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. In addition, the manuscript highlights the key points clearly. The previous significant paper involved were included in the discussion, I suggest to add the significance of the

study and what further research is required. 8. Tables: I congratulate the authors for the captions to the tables very explicative and complete. 9. References: The manuscript reviewed previous related literature.

Scientific quality	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Very good [Y] Grade C: Good [ ] Grade D: Fair [ ] Grade E: Do not publish
Novelty of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [ ] Grade B: Good [Y] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No novelty
Creativity or innovation of this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No creativity or innovation

Scientific significance of the conclusion in this manuscript	[ ] Grade A: Excellent [Y] Grade B: Good [ ] Grade C: Fair [ ] Grade D: No scientific significance
Language quality	[ ] Grade A: Priority publishing [Y] Grade B: Minor language polishing [ ] Grade C: A great deal of language polishing [ ] Grade D: Rejection
Conclusion	[ ] Accept (High priority) [ ] Accept (General priority) [Y] Minor revision [ ] Major revision [ ] Rejection
Re-review	[ ] Yes [Y] No
Peer-reviewer statements	Peer-Review: [Y] Anonymous [ ] Onymous
	Conflicts-of-Interest: [ ] Yes [Y] No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The article "IDENTIFICATION OF MULTIPLE RISK FACTORS FOR COLORECTAL CANCER RELAPSE AFTER LAPAROSCOPIC RADICAL RESECTION" is well written and has an adequate number of patients for a retrospective monocentric study. It is well written and highly interesting. The experiment of the study is designed very well. The analysis of data and consequent results are interesting. As indicated by the authors, larger multicentric studies are needed to consolidate those results. However, the following points must be considered before publication. In my opinion, the ABSTRACT needs to be reorganized so that the background section only describes the background and does not need to summarize all the content of this study. In addition, more language proofing is needed to make the best sense of reading.

Reviewer #1:

Specific Comments to Authors: The article "IDENTIFICATION OF MULTIPLE RISK FACTORS FOR COLORECTAL CANCER RELAPSE AFTER LAPAROSCOPIC RADICAL RESECTION" is well written and has an adequate number of patients for a

retrospective monocentric study. It is well written and highly interesting. The experiment of the study is designed very well. The analysis of data and consequent results are interesting. As indicated by the authors, larger multicentric studies are needed to consolidate those results. However, the following points must be considered before publication. In my opinion, the ABSTRACT needs to be reorganized so that the background section only describes the background and does not need to summarize all the content of this study. In addition, more language proofing is needed to make the best sense of reading.

Reply:Thanks for reading and the ABSTRACT section has been reorganized.

Reviewer #2:

Specific Comments to Authors: Thank you very much for asking me to review this manuscript by Jun Luo et al. This is a retrospective study to identify risk factors for colorectal cancer relapse after laparoscopic radical resection by comparing the baseline data and laboratory indicators of 140 CRC patients, of which 30 relapsed within three years. The result of the study is of interest. Overall, this study was well conducted with good methodology and intelligible English. It might help reduce the risk of disease recurrence and improve patient outcomes. Furthermore, minor comment that I would to proposed:

1.Title: Proper and cover all the core result from the study.

Reply: Thanks for reading.

2.Abstract: Address all of the important component from the study. However, the background section needs to be more concise.

Reply: Thanks for reading and the background section has been reorganized.

3.Key words: could cover this study.

Reply: Thanks for reading.

4.Introduction: Describe the overall basic knowledge for this study. Moreover, the aim of the study is clear.

Reply: Thanks for reading.

5.Method: The present study is methodologically well conducted.

Reply: Thanks for reading.

6.Results: The result of this study is of interest.

Reply: Thanks for reading.

7.Discussion: The manuscript clearly interprets the finding adequately and appropriately. In addition, the manuscript highlights the key points clearly. The previous significant paper involved were included in the discussion, I suggest to add the significance of the study and what further research is required.

Reply: Thanks for reading and the significance of the study and further research had been added in the red part of the conclusion section.

8. Tables: I congratulate the authors for the captions to the tables very explicative and complete.

Reply: Thanks for reading.

9. References: The manuscript reviewed previous related literature.

Reply: Thanks for reading.