To the editor and reviewers,

Firstly, we would like to say thank you for all of the comments and suggestions that were made over our paper.
Below, you see the point-by-point replies to all comments and suggestions. In the revised manuscript, the new sentences and corrections are highlighted in red.

Editor: The figure was made by a professional and ceded to us, so it is not decomposable.

Reviewer #1
The authors have started this review article on a great topic: the effects of diet and functional foods (probiotics and prebiotics) on immune and inflammatory responses in colorectal cancers. However, there are so many language errors/imperfectness. Some sentence even didn't confer clear concepts and specific aspects of research findings. Below are some examples. The authors should seek professional language editing services.

Professional language editing services were seek. The corrections are highlighted in red in the reviewed manuscript.

Reviewer #2:
Authors in the Introduction should point out the key role of microbiome on the onset/progression of another important illness that is NAFLD, even though the therapeutical approach with gut flora modifiers is still on debate as evident in. Future Microbiol. 2015;10(5):889-902. Systematic review on intervention with prebiotics/probiotics in patients with obesity-related nonalcoholic fatty liver disease.

We appreciated the suggestion, and this with other 3 studies were added. Please see the page 8.

Reviewer: 3

1. *The work aims to evaluate the interaction of diet, gut microbiota and host immune system. However, the author seems to just focus on the single disease-CRC, the title, in my opinion, does not reflect the main subject of the manuscript. So I suggest the title be reconsidered.*

In agreement with the Reviewer, we have changed the title in: The role of diet and gut microbiota on colorectal cancer immunomodulation.

2. *Figure 1 has not been cited in the main text.*

As suggested, we have included the figure 1 citation on the page 5.

3. *I think the author need to provide more tables and figures to support their conclusion.*

As suggested and in agreement with the reviewer, we have included a new table (please see the page 5).

4. *Ref #53 is an ineffective citation.*

As suggested by the reviewer, we have checked the citation relevancy and we think that reference is appropriate since the mentioned paper brings information about the role of the natural antioxidants, especially, namely, curcumin, silymarin, which are mentioned in the sentence. We report the right phrase, present in the abstract of the manuscript "The natural antioxidants, namely, curcumin, silymarin, sulforaphane and resveratrol were also effective in raising the MGMT levels to different extents".

5. *Some English grammar errors.*

Professional language editing services were seek. The corrections are red highlighted