

ROUND 1

Dear Editor,

We submitted our manuscript titled “BMI-1 activates hepatic stellate cells to promote EMT of colorectal cancer cells” (WJG81099R) for consideration for publication in *World Journal of Gastroenterology*. We thank the reviewers for their time and valuable comments that have helped us to strengthen our presentation. We have addressed all concerns raised by the reviewers and thoroughly revised the manuscript. Please find a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ critiques.

Reviewer #1:

Scientific Quality: Grade C (Good)

Language Quality: Grade C (A great deal of language polishing)

Conclusion: Major revision

Specific Comments to Authors:

Comment 1: Are there controversies in this field? What are the most recent and important achievements in the field? In my opinion, answers to these questions should be emphasized. Perhaps, in some cases, novelty of the recent achievements should be highlighted by indicating the year of publication in the text of the manuscript.

Response 1: As suggested by the reviewer, this part was rewritten.

Comment 2: The results and discussion section is very weak and no emphasis is given on the discussion of the results like why certain effects are coming in to existence and what could be the possible reason behind them?

Response 2: Thank you for your valuable comment. These parts were rewritten.

Comment 3: Conclusion: not properly written.

Response 3: Thank you for your valuable comment. The conclusion was rewritten.

Comment 4: Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and

conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

Response 4: Thank you for your valuable comment. These parts were rewritten.

Comment 5: The discussion should be rather organized around arguments avoiding simply describing details without providing much meaning. A real discussion should also link the findings of the study to theory and/or literature.

Response 5: Thank you for your valuable comment. The discussion was rewritten.

Comment 6: Spacing, punctuation marks, grammar, and spelling errors should be reviewed thoroughly. I found so many typos throughout the manuscript.

Comment 7: English is modest. Therefore, the authors need to improve their writing style. In addition, the whole manuscript needs to be checked by native English speakers.

Response 6,7: This manuscript was edited for proper English language, grammar, punctuation, spelling, and overall style by one or more of the highly qualified native English speaking editors as you suggested.

Reviewer #2:

Scientific Quality: Grade B (Very good)

Language Quality: Grade B (Minor language polishing)

Conclusion: Accept (General priority)

Specific Comments to Authors: This is a well designed paper and worth to be published.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the time and valuable comments.

We greatly appreciate your kind consideration and look forward to hearing from you.

Best Wishes,

Guanyu Wang, M.D., Ph.D.

Department of General Surgery,

Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital,
School of Medicine, Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China, 310016
Email: wangguanyu@zju.edu.cn

ROUND 2

Dear Editor,

We submitted our manuscript titled “BMI-1 activates hepatic stellate cells to promote EMT of colorectal cancer cells” (WJG81099R2) for consideration for publication in *World Journal of Gastroenterology*. We thank the reviewer for his time and valuable comments that have helped us to strengthen our presentation. We have addressed all concerns raised by the reviewer and editor, and revised the manuscript. Please find a point-by-point response to the critiques.

Comment 1: Results and conclusion: The section devoted to the explanation of the results suffers from the same problems revealed so far. Your storyline in the results section (and conclusion) is hard to follow. Moreover, the conclusions reached are really far from what one can infer from the empirical results.

Response 1: As suggested by the reviewer, this part was rewritten.

Comment 2: Please verify if the manuscript contains informed consent and provide an informed consent form.

Response 2: We uploaded the informed consent form.

Comment 3: Please provide these four fund documents Supported by National Nature Science Foundation of China (No. 81472213), the Health Commission of Zhejiang Province (No. 2019ZD010, No. 2019ZD029), the Science Technology Department of Zhejiang Province (No. LGF20H220001), the Zhejiang Provincial Administration of Traditional Chinese Medicine (No. 2021ZA088).】

Response 3: We provided the four fund documents.

Comment 4: Please supplement the reference position of Figure 3G

Response 4: Thank you for your valuable comment. We added it in Fig 3G.

We greatly appreciate your kind consideration and look forward to hearing from you.

Best Wishes,

Guanyu Wang, M.D., Ph.D.
Department of General Surgery,
Sir Run Run Shaw Hospital,
School of Medicine, Zhejiang University
Hangzhou, China, 310016
Email: wangguanyu@zju.edu.cn