

Dear Editor,

thank you for giving us the opportunity to revise the manuscript. Hereby our responses to reviewers.

Reviewer 1 COMMENT: I think the authors gave a great view of the current and future treatments for CCR. Great review article. However, there are some English corrections to be made. Please find my comments attached.

ANSWER: thank you very much for your revision and your kind words. We appreciated the English corrections and we corrected the manuscript as suggested.

Reviewer 2 COMMENT: The authors reviewed the current status and future perspective of the treatment for the metastatic colorectal cancer. This is a well written article but some concerns should be addressed. Minor comments 1) As described in the guidelines for authors, abbreviations should be defined in the abstract and in the main body of the manuscript upon first mention in the text, except for certain commonly used abbreviations such as DNA, RNA, HIV, LD50, PCR, HBV, ECG, WBC, RBC, CT, ESR, CSF, IgG, ELISA, PBS, ATP, EDTA, and mAb. In addition, the authors don't need to define the same abbreviation (e.g. OS) multiple times in the text. Some abbreviations such as VEGF, EGFR, PFS, and OS should be defined in the text according to the guidelines. 2) What is the difference between mCRC and CRCm? To avoid confusion for the readers, the abbreviation for metastatic colorectal cancer should be unified to mCRC or CRCm. 3) This manuscript has no Figures and Tables. The authors should include some Figures or Tables in the text for a better understanding of the readers.

ANSWER: Thank you very much for these precious suggestions. 1) we defined the abbreviations in the text as correctly suggested. 2) we unified the abbreviation for metastatic colorectal cancer (mCRC). 3) we included a table and a figure as suggested.

Kind Regards,

Sara Cherri MD