

Dear editor,

Thanks you very much for your positive and constructive comments and suggestions.

As suggested, the manuscript has been revised. The questions of the editor and reviewer have been answered below point by point and underline the changes made in the text. We have verified the placement and accuracy of each reference in our manuscript as well as the accuracy of the values in our figures. Also, we have checked complete contact information for all authors, including titles, mail addresses, phone numbers and e-mail addresses.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

With kindest regards,

Yours Sincerely

Reviewer #1: Specific comments:

1. Please change "disorders.Moreover" to "disorders. Moreover".

Response: Following your request, we have changed "disorders.Moreover" to "disorders. Moreover".

2. Please change "Pittsburgh S1leep Quality Index" to "Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index".

Response: Following your request, we have changed "Pittsburgh S1leep Quality Index" to "Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index".

3. Please provide more information about your hospital, e.g. is it a tertiary hospital with a specialized neurosurgical unit?

Response: The name of Our hospital is the affiliated brain hospital of Nanjing medical university, which is a tertiary hospital with a specialized neurosurgical unit.

4. How was sample size determined? There is currently no evidence of power calculation. The present sample appears small and limited to a convenience sample.

Response: There are many research teams in our hospital. The data of each team is not shared. Our team only followed up 549 patients from May 2012 to August 2019.

5. Please recheck "Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.83$ ".

Response: we have chenged "Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.83$ " to "Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.83$ ".

6. Please do a close edit of the entire manuscript for language and grammar. It should be 'themselves' and not 'themsel'. Do you know 'implicit' rather than 'unimplied'.

Response: we have chenged them 'themselves' . And the language has been edited by Elsevier Webshop Support.

7. What is "gave unimplied answers to the questions that the interviewees did not understand"? Please rephrase.

Response: We changed it to " when the interviewees could not understand it, we gave them answers in popular and easy-to-understand language".

8. Please report the exact P-values rather than simply $P < 0.05$. Statistical results should include confidence intervals or exact P values, even for non-significant results. All statistical results should be reported according to the SAMPL Guidelines (Statistical Analyses and Methods in the

Published Literature).

Response: we have gave confidence intervals or exact P values.

9. Rather than present the data as "t=-0.786, P= 0.017", you should present the exact P-value and its associated 95% CI.

Response: we have gave confidence intervals and exact P values.

10. The study limitations and areas for future work should be at least briefly discussed. For example, a more systematic examination of sleep disturbance is warranted to inform the development of better symptom management programs in this population.

Response: Following your request, we have added the "The limitation of this study is that it did not investigate whether the patient had previous related diseases such as sleep disorders and whether there was a history of related drugs that affect sleep; in addition, this study only discussed the relationship between age, gradual time and gradual radiotherapy and chemotherapy and the quality of sleep of patients Subsequent research work can further explore the relationship between patients' sleep quality and the impact of family and social support, and constantly explore feasible nursing intervention methods to ensure that patients receive comprehensive and effective alternative nursing services. And a more systematic examination of sleep disturbance is warranted to inform the development of better symptom management programs in this population."

11. Please recheck this reference, "4. Megan Soohwa Jeon, Haryana m. Dhillon, and Meera r. Agar. Sleep disturbance of adults with a brain tumor and their family caregivers:A systematic review. *neuro-oncology*, 2017,19 (8) 1035-1046."

Response: we have changed it to "Jeon MS, Dhillon HM, Agar MR. Sleep disturbance of adults with a brain tumor and their family caregivers: a systematic review. *Neuro Oncol*. 2017;19(8):1035-1046".

Editorial Office's comments

The author must revise the manuscript according to the Editorial Office's comments and suggestions, which listed below:

(1) Science Editor: 1 Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the expression of Notch pathway components in colorectal tumors. The topic is within the scope of the WJCC. (1) Classification: Grade B; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: The manuscript need to major revision according to the comment. And the questions raised by the reviewers need be answered; and (3) Format: There are 3 tables. A total of 17 references are cited, including 5 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade C. A language editing certificate issued by Elsevier Language Editing Services was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, the signed Copyright License Agreement, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. The Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure Form and written informed consent were not qualified. No academic misconduct was found in the CrossCheck detection and Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an unsolicited manuscript. The study was supported by 1 grant. The topic has not previously been published in the WJCC. 5 Issues raised: (1) The language classification is Grade C. Please visit the following website for the professional English language editing companies we recommend: <https://www.wjgnet.com/bpg/gerinfo/240>; (2) The authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application

form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s); (3) PMID and DOI numbers are missing in the reference list. Please provide the PubMed numbers and DOI citation numbers to the reference list and list all authors of the references. Please revise throughout; and (4) The “Article Highlights” section is missing. Please add the “Article Highlights” section at the end of the main text. 6 Re-Review: Required. 7 Recommendation: Conditional acceptance.

Response: (1) we have sent our article to another professional English language editing company of American Journal Experts (AJE) for further English edition. The number is Y2Y95LX2. (2) We have submitted the approved grant application form. (3) PMID and DOI numbers have been added. (4) “Article Highlights” section has been added at the end of the main text.

(2) Editorial Office Director: I have checked the comments written by the science editor.

Response: Thanks.

(3) Company Editor-in-Chief: I have reviewed the Peer-Review Report, the full text of the manuscript, the relevant ethics documents, and the English Language Certificate, all of which have met the basic publishing requirements of the World Journal of Clinical Cases, and the manuscript is conditionally accepted. I have sent the manuscript to the author(s) for its revision according to the Peer-Review Report, Editorial Office’s comments and the Criteria for Manuscript Revision by Authors.

Response: Thanks.