

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Minor revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This manuscript constructed an clinical model of colorectal cancer, to investigate molecular biomarkers that accurately predict prognosis would be of great clinical significance using multivariate Cox regression and stratification analysis. lncRNAs are frequently aberrantly expressed in colorectal cancer. This paper is written smoothly with clear thinking and detailed experimental methods, but there are some minor problems:

1. Page3, in the last line of the first paragraph, the abbreviation CRC should be placed in the fourth line of the first paragraph where it first appears.

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, we revised it with red.

2. Page3, " With the aim of elucidating the prognostic function of multiple lncRNAs served as biomarkers in colorectal cancer (CRC)."may have grammatical errors?

Reply: Thank you for your review, we revised it.

3. Page6, the line4 of the Introduction, It's better to be able to explain the number of the 5-year survival rate of CRC.

Reply: Thank you for your recommend, we have added the number of the 5-year survival rate of CRC with reference [2]

4. Overall survival of the patients who were included is more than 30days. 30 days may a bit short?

Reply: Thank you for your recommend, it means

5. Page10, the line 5, why the optimal cut-off point is 5.38? It should has more explanation.

Reply: Thank you for your review, the optimal cut-off point (5.38) was identified based on median value of the risk score.

6. You should add a Table that summarizes patient information about different groups.

Reply: Thank you very much. We have resubmitted a Supplementary Table that summarizes patient information about different groups.

7. In Page12, in 3.6, why common clinical features of CRC only have stage and gender? It need more.

Reply: Thank you for your suggestion, however the results of stratified survival analysis in other common clinical features were no statistically significant difference and we modified the "Stratified survival analysis of common clinical features" to "Stratified survival analysis of Stage and Gender".

Overall, I think this article has certain innovation, but there are also some problems with grouping and statistics. I think this article needs to be reviewed again after revision.

Reply: Thank you. Thank you very much!

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a reasonable study with sufficient evidence. However, there are several mistakes and typos and should be edited via native English speaker before accepted.

Reply: Thank you for your review. Our manuscript has been edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one or more of the highly qualified native English speaking editors at AJE. And the Editing Certificate is resubmitted as the supplementary material. Please pay attention to check it, thank you very much.