

To editor and reviewers of World Journal of Gastroenterology,

We are so grateful for the favorable comments about our manuscript entitled: “Colorectal peritoneal metastases: Optimal management review” (Invited Manuscript by World Journal of Gastroenterology, Author number ID: 00075117). We have taken into account all the interesting comments made by the reviewers, which will improve the quality of our study.

(Reviewers code: 00183059, 02954382, and 02982391)

Reviewer 1:

Reviewer #1: Colorectal carcinomatosis: Optimal management and future perspectives I read with great interest the above titled review. However, there are several problems in the manuscript 1. The manuscript looks like a chapter of a book rather than a review submitted to a medical/scientific journal. The authors should have an abstract. The flow of writing and the format of the manuscript should be reviewed to match with a review style. 2. Introduction: The flow of writing is not well organized, and there are sudden shifts. We need to know the rationale of the review. Why this review was written, what is the focus, and research questions to be answered, or the framework that the authors will address in this review. Some statements need to have references. 3. Page 3: out of n where there is a jump into recommendations management of PMs on emergency surgery. 4. The different parts are not connected and the readers will find it difficult to follow. It looks like a bad summary of a book. The subtitles are not connected. We do not write subtitles like CRS + HIPEC, in a scientific review. 5. The Follow-up and future lines of research are not clearly written. 6. Conclusions: this should be carefully written to give a meaningful conclusive summary. What is the prognosis? 7. References: The list of references should be reviewed. For example, ref number 23, should be a proper research paper. What is the rule for placing et al? in reference 39 I see it placed after 6 authors, and in ref 37 and ref 101, placed after 3 authors, What is the trouble with ref 58? 8. The main problems are: not writing in a format of a journal review, no abstract, difficult to read, sudden jumps, recommendations given on page 3, not organized, current and future research is not well written, the conclusion is meaningless, and looks like a bad summary of a book.

Comments to reviewer 1:

We agree with you and we are so grateful for your comments that will improve the quality of our manuscript.

Major points to review:

1-4. We have modified the whole structure of the article so it would fit as a literature review better. An abstract have been provided. The flow of writing have been reviewed by a native English speaker to match with a review style and we provide the correction certificate. To know the rationale of the review, we have added an objectives section to summarize the aim of this review and its current importance. We have created a new structure, more organized and fluent, subtitles have been corrected. The expression "CRS+HIPEC" have been changed to "CRS plus HIPEC" throughout the manuscript.

5. The current and future lines of research have been restructured and reviewed for a better understanding

6. We added a conclusive summary as recommended.

7. The list of references have been carefully reviewed and modified to fit the instructions of the WJG. All the "et al" have been replaced by all the authors. Highlighted reference –an error- (58) has been corrected. Citation 23 is not a research paper; it belongs to the UptoDate website, so we have cited it as it is.

Reviewer 2:

Reviewer's report Title: Colorectal carcinomatosis: Optimal management and future perspectives Date: March 20, 2019 Reviewer's report: Some type errors, through the manuscript, should be corrected by authors. a) In the section "State of the art" TMN should be corrected in TNM (tumor- node- metastasis) b) In the section "Clinical Presentation of Peritoneal Metastases from Colorectal Cancer" the part of the sentence "with a 5-year survival of 93-72%" should be corrected in "with a 5-year survival of 72-93%". c) The word "Colorrectal cancer" should be corrected in "Colorectal cancer". d) In the section "Conclusions" on the second line the abbreviation "CCR" should be corrected in "CRC" 1 Title. Does the title reflect the main subject/hypothesis of the manuscript? The title of the manuscript should be changed from "Colorectal carcinomatosis: Optimal management and future perspectives" to " Peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal cancer: Optimal management and future perspectives". 2 Abstract. Does the abstract summarize and reflect the work described in the manuscript? Yes 3 Key words. Do the key words reflect the focus of the manuscript? Yes 4 Background. Does the manuscript adequately describe the background, present status and significance of the study? Introduction generally is ok, but at the end of this section, the authors should added what they aimed by this review. Other sections of this review are well designed, prescribing and analyzed the latest information about Peritoneal carcinomatosis from colorectal origin, and current management of this entity. The

sections named “Neoadjuvancy” and “Adjuvancy” should be corrected by authors in “Neoadjuvant chemotherapy”, and “Adjuvant chemotherapy”, respectively. 5 Illustrations and tables. Are the figures, diagrams and tables sufficient, good quality and appropriately illustrative of the paper contents? Do figures require labeling with arrows, asterisks etc., better legends? The tables and figures are OK. 6 References. Does the manuscript cite appropriately the latest, important and authoritative references in the introduction and discussion sections? Does the author self-cite, omit, incorrectly cite and/or over-cite references? In this manuscript are cited the latest, important, and relevant references. 7 Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? Is the style, language and grammar accurate and appropriate? Generally Yes.

Comments to reviewer 2:

We would like to thank your good consideration of our manuscript. We are also thankful for your time expended in checking the language mistakes we had, as English is not our first language. We have carefully check through your recommendations and we also had our manuscript send for a proper language correction company.

Minor points to review:

- a) We have corrected the TNM acronym.
- b) We changed the order to “with a 5-year survival of 72-93%”, as recommended.
- c) All the CCR acronyms have been changed for the English form CRC, as recommended.
- d) We have changed our title, including “peritoneal metastases” instead of “carcinomatosis” and also to fit the 6-word limit for the WJG.
- e) We have changed the word “Neoadjuvancy” to “Neoadjuvant chemotherapy” and “Adjuvancy” to “Adjuvant chemotherapy”

Reviewer 3:

This paper demonstrated review articles about peritoneal dissemination of colorectal cancer. This article includes the contents from the diagnosis of this disease, treatment and to the future prospective. This

paper was well-written and very useful article as a textbook. Therefore, I decided this study should be accepted in the journal of "World Journal of Gastroenterology".

Comments to reviewer 3:

We are really thankful for the interest and consideration of our work and manuscript. Our main intention indeed is that this review could help as a textbook for surgical and oncological physicians to easily access to the latest management and treatment options for the peritoneal disease from colorectal origin.

We are glad that you have enjoyed our updated review and that you consider that it has the enough quality to be part of the WJG.