

To reviewer 1

1. In main text, figure 1 was divided into 1A and 1B. But, in figure legend it was not reflected.

Reply: we are sorry for this mistake. We revised the figure legend.

2. In general, symbols for genes are italicized. please check.

Reply: Thanks for this kindly reminding. We have our paper revised by a native speaker of English in Editage.

3. The authors said that amino acid sequences of the APC mutations were evaluated with the Mutation Taster, and it was provided with supplementary data. But, I can't find the supplementary data.

Reply: we added the supplementary data in this version.

4. There are a few awkward expression and type errors in the manuscript. please check once again by native speaker.

Reply: Thanks for this kindly reminding. We have our paper revised by a native speaker of English in Editage.

To reviewer 2

1. I suggest only a minor revision of the manuscript to better clarify the distinction from the part of methods and of the results. I think that at moment it is not so clear the distinction of the two parts.

Reply: we added the methods section in this version.

2. Moreover I suggest checking for oversights. A just want to suggest to remove “and a review of the literature” because in that case, the authors should have to describe and report in a much more detailed way the information present in the literature, accompanying it with many more references than those currently present in the manuscript.

Reply: This is a professional suggestion. We revised the title accordingly.