

Response to reviewers

First of all, we would like to thank you for your careful review of our paper (NO.39949). We are especially pleased to receive the manuscript to be revised. Now we respond to the reviewers.

Respond to reviewer 1#

Q1:

Response :We have invited professional English institutions to polish and advance the English level of the paper.

Q2:

Response :Method of data collection and statistical method were depicted in the method in abstract for providing quantitative information. And aim was limited in 20 words.

Q3:

Response :We have concentrated the main conclusions of this article.

Q4:

Response :We have consulted the relevant literature, and there are not many similar studies on colorectal cancer, so this paper has certain novelty.

Q5:

The suggested reference were added into the paper.

Thank you for your reviewing our paper.

Respond to reviewer 2#

Q1:

Being re-discussed, we believe that the logic of the article and the organization reach the publication standard, which is similar to your point of view.

Q2:

The topic was modified in order to be more suitable for this paper.

Q3:

Summary is correct and clear which is similar to ours and the opinion of professional English polishing institution. However, in order to meet the requirements of your journal, we will concentrate the words within 20 words in the abstract. No major changes have been made in the text.

Q4:

Part of instruction have not been changed largely.

Q5:

Part of method in abstract was given more details about analysis and quantitative information . Part of method in text was concise and accurate.

Q5:

Thanks to give a good comments to the results which were checked and there was no error.

Q6:

About discussion and conclusion, we have checked again, conclusion was combined to discussion. The conclusion is simplified. It is the most important highlight that the guiding value of AJCC-8 classification for patients with peritoneal metastasis. The individualized treatment for patients with stage IV colorectal cancer is placed in the perspective section of Highlights.

Thanks for your reviewing and giving a “good” comments.

Re-respond to the reviewer

Fist of all, we thank you give us many suggestions. Now I respond you on behalf of all authors.

Q1: This paper was polished by a specialized company. I required the company, they say the English level was very good though it was not at the excellent level. If the article is accepted, the English level should have little effect. And I have re-checked the total paper to eliminate the litter error. We hope you give us a good comment about this,thank you.

Q2:We add some detail in the abstract to provide quantitative information. But we can't add more details like the part of the Patients and Follow-up in the text.

Q3: It was concise about the conclusion that AJCC-8TH staging of CRC has no effect on prognosis compared to AJCC-7TH staging, except that there is a worse prognosis in the inferior vena cava stage of the sub-stage. This shows that peritoneal metastasis has a worse prognosis than organ metastasis. And I add an importance conclusion of the focus treatment for advanced CRC patients.

Q4 Thank you to give us the suggestions. More citations indicate that the article is more convincing. We have retrieved the literature you provided. But there are 4 citations we could not retrieve,and did not add them to the paper. They are as follows: Can. Ther., 8: 6-14 (2011).; Eryp. Pharm. J., 9: 133-179 (2010).; Anti Can. Res 58, 437-494 (2013).; Biointerf. Res. Appl. Chem., 6: 1356-1379 (2016). We hope that the impact will be small. In addition, the added references are marked in different colors for your editing. Apologise for any inconvenience.

Thank you again to give us good comments and thank you also for your support in the publication of our article.

Yours Sincerely

Guojun Tong