Mar 12, 2021
Editorial Office
World Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery
Re: Revision of Manuscript (NO: 62056, Retrospective Study)
Dear Editors:
We would like to thank you very much for your decision letter and the positive review of our manuscript entitled "**A novel parameter based on lipid indicators ratio improves the prognostic value of plasma lipid levers in resectable colorectal cancer patients"**. The thoughtful comments and good suggestions have helped us to improve the manuscript.
We have read your letter and the comments carefully, and the concerns have been addressed appropriately. The revised manuscript with changes highlighted in red has been submitted for your further consideration. In addition, point-by-point responses to the comments are provided below this letter. This revised manuscript has been edited and proofread by native English speaker.
We greatly appreciate your interest in our work. If there is any remaining issue, please feel free to let us know.
Sincerely,
Kailin Cai
Department of Gastrointestinal Surgery Union Hospital, Tongji Medical College Huazhong University of Science and Technology Wuhan, Hubei 430022, China
Tel: +86-13971086496
E-mail: caikailin@hust.edu.cn

Point-by-point responses to reviewers' remarks:
Reviewer #1:
this topic is interesting, and i wonder if in the future, it can help to find a treatment modality for colorectal cancer..
Response: Thank you very much for your helpful review of our manuscript, and we sincerely appreciate your recognition of our work.

1. in some parts of the paper you mentioned that you followed up the patients every 3 months, despite in other parts of your work you mentioned that this article is a retrospective one.
Response: In this study, we retrospectively collected the clinical characteristics of all patients, and we obtained the survival of most patients through follow-up. (**MATERIALS AND METHODS Follow-up section, line 140-151, page 5-6)**

2. is the follow up of patients included occult blood in tool, GI endoscopy or not
Response: No occult blood was found in the patients followed up. A small number of patients underwent endoscopic examination, but this part of data has not been completely statistical.

3. if it is a prospective study, how many cases lost follow up

Response: This study was a retrospective study, and no cases were lost to follow-up.

Point-by-point responses to editorial office's comments:

Science editor: Scientific quality: The manuscript describes a retrospective study of the expression of lipid parameter for colorectal cancer prognosis. The topic is within the scope of the WJG. (1) Classification: Grade C; (2) Summary of the Peer-Review Report: This topic is interesting, and it can help to find a treatment modality for colorectal cancer. In some parts of the paper you mentioned that you followed up the patients every 3 months, despite in other parts of your work you mentioned that this article is a retrospective one. Is the follow up of patients included occult blood in tool, GI endoscopy or not? The questions raised by the reviewers should be answered; and (3) Format: There are 5 tables and 2 figures. A total of 47 references are cited, including 15 references published in the last 3 years. There are no self-citations. 2 Language evaluation: Classification: Grade B. A language editing certificate issued by ShineWrite was provided. 3 Academic norms and rules: The authors provided the Biostatistics Review Certificate, and the Institutional Review Board Approval Form. The authors need to provide informed consent. No academic misconduct was found in the Bing search. 4 Supplementary comments: This is an invited manuscript. The study was supported by Science and Technology Department of Hubei Province; and The National Natural Science Foundation of China. The topic has not previously been published in the WJG. The corresponding author has not published articles in the BPG.

Response: Thank you very much for your helpful review of our manuscript, and we sincerely appreciate your recognition of our work. The revised manuscript with changes highlighted in red has been submitted for your further consideration, and point-by-point responses to the reviewer's comments are provided in this letter.

1. I found the authors did not provide the approved grant application form(s). Please upload the approved grant application form(s) or funding agency copy of any approval document(s).

Response: Thank you very much for your helpful review of our manuscript. We have uploaded copies of the approval documents for the fund grants.

2. I found the authors did not provide the original figures. Please provide the original figure documents. Please prepare and arrange the figures using PowerPoint to ensure that all graphs or arrows or text portions can be reprocessed by the editor.

Response: Thank you for your helpful comments, which helped us to improve the manuscript. Our Kaplan-Meier curve figures were generated and exported by R 3.5.1 (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria), and we arranged all the original figures with PowerPoint and uploaded them.

3. I found the authors did not write the "article highlight" section. Please write the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text.

Response: Thank you very much for your helpful review of our manuscript. We have added the "article highlights" section at the end of the main text. (**ARTICLE**

HIGHLIGHTS section, line 395-424, page 14-15)

*4.please don't include any *, #, †, §, ‡, ¥, @....in your manuscript; Please use superscript numbers for illustration; and for statistical significance, please use superscript letters. Statistical significance is expressed as aP <0.05, bP <0.01 (P > 0.05 usually does not need to be denoted). If there are other series of P values, cP <0.05 and dP <0.01 are used, and a third series of P values is expressed as eP <0.05 and fP <0.01.*

Response: Thank you very much for your helpful review of our manuscript. We have removed symbols such as *, #⋯ from the manuscript. We use the superscript numbers for illustration, and the superscript letters for statistical significance.

5. Please write the "Conclusion" section at the end of the main text.

Response: Thank you very much for your helpful review of our manuscript. We put the "Conclusion" section at the end of the main text. (**CONCLUSION section, line 384-393, page 13-14)**

6. Re-Review: Required. Recommendation: Conditionally accepted..

Response: Thank you very much for your helpful review of our manuscript, and we sincerely appreciate your recognition of our work.