

March 21, 2022

Dear Dr. Tarnawski,

We have provided a point-by-point response to the comments of the reviewers regarding our manuscript entitled "**Micelles as potential drug delivery systems for colorectal cancer treatment**" (Manuscript NO.: 75074, Minireview).

We hope that our paper is now in a form that is acceptable for publication, and we look forward to your positive response.

Sincerely,



Hala Gali-Muhtasib, PhD
Professor
Department of Biology
American University of Beirut
Lebanon

Answers to Reviewers Comments

Reviewer #1

Comment 1: Methods. Does the manuscript describe methods (e.g., experiments, data analysis, surveys, and clinical trials, etc.) in adequate detail? No. There is no explanation for criteria of literature search

Answer 1: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We have added the criteria for literature search at the end of the introduction lines 19-23 page 5 stating that: Published studies included in this minireview were identified through searching PubMed and Google scholar using different permutations of these keywords “colorectal cancer” or “colon cancer”, “chemotherapy” or “gene therapy”, “combination”, and “micelle”. Clinical trials were identified through searching <https://clinicaltrials.gov> using two keywords “micelle” and “cancer”.

Comment 2: 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? There is no tables and illustration, but the presence of tables could improve clarity of the article.

Answer 2: We have included one table and one figure in the first submission. They were listed at the end of the manuscript after the references as per the journal guidelines. A second figure has been added in the revised manuscript. So, now the revised paper has two figures and one detailed table.

Comment 3: Quality of manuscript organization and presentation. Is the manuscript well, concisely and coherently organized and presented? The organization could be improved as coherence and conciseness

Answer 3:

Coherence and conciseness have been improved throughout the revised manuscript. Introductory sentences were included in sections that were missing an introductory sentence. A section was added on polymeric micelles in clinical trials, and we have elaborated on the mechanism and mode of action of the polymeric micelles system on cancer.

Reviewer #3:

Comment 1: It is highly recommended that the authors elaborate more details on the mechanism and mode of action of the polymeric micelles system on cancer, or even explain it as a separate paragraph, better to be supplemented by necessary diagrams.

Answer 1: We thank the reviewer for this comment. We added a paragraph on page 6 lines 28-29 and page 7 lines 1-10 to explain the mechanism and mode of action of the polymeric micelles system on cancer, and we have included a figure relevant to this section (Figure 1).

Comment 2: Are there any ongoing registered clinical trials about polymeric micelles and their application in CRC? If so, it is recommended that the authors make necessary summaries and comments.

Answer 2: We have added a section on polymeric micelles in clinical trials on page 15 lines 17-29 and on page 16 lines 1-17. Also a sentence was included in the conclusion section on page 17, lines 13-15 highlighting the future clinical application of polymeric micelles.