

Dear Prof. Maximilian Reiser:

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript, we appreciated editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled “**Long noncoding RNA RP4 functions as a competing endogenous RNA through miR-7-5p sponge activity in colorectal cancer**”. (ID: **37130**).

We have studied reviewer’s comments carefully and have made revision which marked in red in the paper. We have tried our best to revise our manuscript according to the comments. Attached please find the revised version, which we would like to submit for your kind consideration.

We would like to express our great appreciation to you and reviewers for the comments on our paper. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Thank you and best regards.

Yours sincerely,

Wen-Bin Wang

Corresponding author:

Name: Wen-Bin Wang

E-mail: [surdoctor@163.com](mailto:surdoctor@163.com) or [nihao22009256@163.com](mailto:nihao22009256@163.com)

List of Responses

Dear Editors and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “**Long noncoding RNA RP4 functions as a competing endogenous RNA through miR-7-5p sponge activity in colorectal cancer**”. (ID: **37130**). 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 portions are marked in red in the paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer :

#### 1. COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

I have read with great interest this experimental study. It is very well written and well designed. The literature is full of potential-promising markers for colorectal cancer therapy, but this time the Authors gave good experiments also including in vivo model. My general suggestion is to write in a different manner the results, so the readers can understand immediately the overall messages. Indeed, I suggest to present in a first part of the results section the results on cell lines, and in a second part the results on mice. In the opinion of this reviewer this may be very important. I suggest also to expand the discussion when the authors speak about the potential application of such marker in clinical therapy and where future researches on this topic may go to achieve novel results or confirmations..

**Response:** Thank you very much for your positive response and your question. We have changed the manner of the results followed by the recommendations. Please see the manuscript (Result sections, pages: 8).