

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the reviewing of our paper and for highlighting the points to be addressed in response to the reviewer comments. We provided herein a detailed point-by-point description of how we have addressed all concerns in our revised manuscript. We hope that the revised version of our paper will fulfill the referee's expectations and will be published in *WJGE*.

### **Reply to the Reviewer's comments**

1- The authors provide a comprehensive review focused on the implication in colon cancer of mechanisms associated with the regulation of nuclear receptor pathways. Although the tables summarize the main effectors and observations already done relative to their activity, it is also important to provide an overall mechanistic overview integrating the pathways in which these proteins are involved and the main alterations so far reported. In this regard, the inclusion of a schema is recommended.

As suggested by the referee, we have included the requested schema as Figure 1.

2- Edit on page 10 "In a study performed on 27 primary colon adenocarcinomas, it has been showed (must be shown)...."

This has been corrected in the revised version.

### **Reply to the Editorial comments**

1- Please provide the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s)/letter(s).

They have been provided with the revised version.

2- The conflict-of-interest statement must be signed by the corresponding author and provided in a PDF format, and the statement must also be mentioned as a footnote in the manuscript text.

This has been done and the file provided with the revised version.

3- Please reformat all the reference numbers.

This has been corrected as requested

4- The author should provide the first page of the paper without PMID and DOI.

We have checked all references and added the PMID/DOI that were missing.

5- Please provide the excel version of the tables.

This has been provided with the revised version.