

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for considering our manuscript entitled “Consolidation Chemotherapy with Capecitabine after Neoadjuvant Chemoradiotherapy in High-Risk Patients with Locally Advanced Rectal Cancer: Propensity Score Study” (Manuscript NO: 77420) and providing us with the opportunity to resubmit the revised version to your esteemed journal. We also greatly appreciate your efforts and those of the three reviewers, whose specific comments and suggestions provided valuable feedback, helping us improve our manuscript. All comments have been seriously considered, and modifications have been made in the revised manuscript. We also have revised the format according to the author’s guidelines of your esteemed journal. A new language certificate have been provided. We hope the revised manuscript will meet your journal’s standards. Because of the extensive attention on the intensification of neoadjuvant therapy in locally advanced rectal cancer, we believe that this study, which provided a new evidence for the individualized treatment of patients, would be of great interest to readers of *World Journal of Gastrointestinal Oncology*.

Our point-by-point responses to the three reviewers’ comments were attached as follows. If there are any additional questions, please inform us, so we can further try to resolve them. Thank you for your consideration.

With best regards,

WeiHu Wang

Key Laboratory of Carcinogenesis and Translational Research (Ministry of Education/Beijing), Department of Radiation Oncology, Peking University Cancer Hospital and Institute, Beijing 100142, P. R. China

Email: wangweiHu88@163.com

Response to Reviewer #1:

Comments: written well i accept

Response: Thanks for your comments.

Response to Reviewer #2:

1. Comments: The article is within the scope of the journal and deals with an interesting topic. It is well written and structured. His reading is fluent. The experiment is well designed and the results of it are described. In this sense, it is an original and innovative contribution to the area of knowledge.

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable comment. Your recognition of our work is deeply appreciated.

2. Comments: However, some aspects should be improved: a) In the introductory section, the study on the state of the art should be extended. b) In the discussion section, the presented work should be compared with other similar works, showing the advances and limitations. c) The conclusions section should be extended to establish what is the main scientific contribution of the article and indicate a set of lines of future work.

Response: Thank you very much for your valuable comment. We have corrected it according to your suggestion in the revised manuscript: a) In the introductory section, We have systematically summarized the relevant reference in additional induction and consolidation chemotherapy in neoadjuvant therapy, such as GCR-3, CAO/ARO/AIO-12, RAPIDO, PRODIGE 23 and so on. We have also added references of consolidation chemotherapy with capecitabine monotherapy in the last paragraph in this section. b) In the discussion section, we have compared our study with other works such as CAO/ARO/AIO-12, Garcia-Aguilar et al. study, Zampino et al. study, and the OIGIT-01 trial in paragraph 4 and 5. We have also added the discussion of long-term results in paragraph 6 in this section. c) In the end of conclusions section, the future work of phase 3, multicenter, randomized studies were mentioned.

Response to Reviewer #3:

Comments: This topic is very attractive for the oncological community. The manuscript is well written. In my opinion, the manuscript may be suitable for publication.

Response: Thanks for your comments.