Dear Editors and reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and for the reviewers' comments concerning our manuscript entitled ‘Bibliometric analysis of randomized controlled trials of colorectal cancer over the last decade’ (ID: 55628). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The main corrections in the paper and the responds to the reviewer s comments are as flowing:

Responds to the reviewers comments：

Reviewer #1.
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision
Specific Comments to Authors: The study is undertaken to evaluate the clinical trials of randomized controlled trials of colorectal cancer all the world over the past decade. It is an interesting study that provides evidence on this subject, especially on the countries and universities organizing such trials and on the journals publishing them. However, it is suggested to the authors either to reconsider the aim of their document or to remove (or revise) all comparisons of China with the rest of the world (abstract and discussion). There are also some typo/grammar errors requiring correction before the m/s is being accepted for publication. 1.Page 1, line 17: Replace “has” with “have”.

2. Figure 3: Correct x-axis legend and replace the name of England with “UK”. 3. Table 1: Correct the name “English” (two times) in second column with “UK”. 4. Table 2: Correct the name “English” (eleven times) in fourth column with “UK”.
5. Page 1, line 33: Write the names of the researchers with the initial letter capital.

Response:
I should like to express my appreciation to you for suggesting how to improve our paper.
1. After reconsidering the aim of our document, I rewrote the abstract and discussion. Our aims are to investigate the randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of global colorectal cancer spanning 2008 to 2018 and to provide suggestions for conducting Chinese RCTs of colorectal cancer. I kept the content of the article consistent with the title.
2. I have asked a professional retouching team to retouch my article. All the problems have been revised.

Reviewer #2:
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision
Specific Comments to Authors: this topic is interesting, but some comments are highlighted below: 1-I think the last 2 years i.e 2019, 2020, there is a difference in favor of studies published in china. 2-impact factor is not good indicative of journal quality. 3-some sentences is not understood, please rewrite them 4- language editing need

polishing (some of them in the uploaded file)
Response:
Thank you for your good suggestions.
1. We investigated the randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of global colorectal cancer spanning 2008 to 2018. I finished my article in October 2019. 2020 is not over, so the RCTs
in 2020 is excluded.
2. Impact factor has now become a common international evaluation index for journals. It is not only an indicator to measure the usefulness and display of journals, but also an important indicator to measure the academic level of journals and even the quality of papers. Impact factor is a relative statistic.
3.4. I have asked a professional retouching team to retouch my article. All the problems have been revised.

Reviewer #3.
Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)
Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)
Conclusion: Minor revision
In the revised form of the m/s, the authors have followed some of the reviewers' suggestions, especially regarding the emphasis given in m/s to Chinese clinical trials. However, reconsidering the aim of the study usually results to title revision, but the title of the revised form of the m/s is not clear. As the title is written in the revised form, it seems that the name of an author is included in the title. In addition, as it is written in the aim of the revised form, the study provides suggestions for conducting Chinese RCTs of colorectal cancer. However, there are no substantial changes in discussion section of revised form, or anywhere throughout the m/s. The authors should be more focused to the aim of their m/s and to organize the text accordingly, otherwise the m/s cannot be accepted for publication.
Response:
Thank reviewer for good comments and hard work.
1. Following your comments, I rewrote the discussion. I kept the discussion of the article consistent with the rest. Our aims are to investigate the randomized controlled trials (RCTs) of global colorectal cancer spanning 2008 to 2018 and to provide suggestions for conducting Chinese RCTs of colorectal cancer.
2. I wrote the name of an author before the running title because I thought it was the requirement of the magazine.

Reviewer #4:
Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very Good)
Language Quality: Grade A (Priority publishing)
Conclusion: Accept (General priority)
it looks that the authors answered all my comments, so now it is accepted for publication
Response:

Thank you for good comments and hard work.

I have reedited the paper following the list of issues that need to be addressed by authors in a conditionally-accepted manuscript to make our paper more better.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And here we did not list the changes but marked in red in revised paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers' warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Best regards,
Jun-Hong Hu
hjh-8282@163.com