Reply to Reviewers

Dear Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your letter and the reviewers’ comments concerning our manuscript entitled “Recommendations for articles and reviews in colorectal cancer-related research at the year-end of 2023” (Manuscript number: 94242). These comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. We have studied comments carefully and have made corrections which we hope meet with approval. We used track changes mode to revise part of the manuscript. We have revised and resubmitted the revised manuscript. The main corrections in the paper and the responses to the reviewer’s comments are as follows:

Responds to the reviewer’s comments:

Reviewer #1:

Congratulation for the ingenue idea and work. The manuscript presents a summary of papers reviewed over 2023 by a (perhaps) senior editorial board member. While listing and summarizing the reviews is very informative, laudable and reflects the course of the year-long work, one should have expected some methodological insights upon the review process in itself instead of an automatic summary of above-mentioned reviews. Briefly the human nor to say professoral input is barely visible if at all. This reviewer wonders if we are indeed entering the epoch of purely automated information in which human judgement, expertise, challenges and difficulties natural to the process, become obsolete.

Author response and action taken: Thank you for recognizing the effort put into summarizing the year-long work. In response to your valuable feedback, we have now included a new section dedicated to the methodological insights upon the review process. This section highlights the role of human judgment, expertise, and the inherent challenges and
difficulties encountered during the review process. We have also discussed how these human elements interact with and complement the automated aspects of the review system, ensuring that the final output is not only informative but also retains the essential human touch.

Reviewer #2:

This is a well written editorial. The only concern is that there are three coauthors, yet throughout the text, it looks like there is only one author. For example, it begins with 'As a peer reviewer of ...., my weekly routine ..." in the Abstract. This has to be revised.

**Author response and action taken:** We appreciate your attention to detail and acknowledge the oversight. We have revised the text to accurately reflect the collaborative nature of our work. The narrative now uses plural pronouns and inclusive language such as "As peer reviewers..." and "our weekly routine..." in the abstract and throughout the manuscript to represent all coauthors. This change ensures that the text accurately conveys the collective efforts and insights of all the authors involved.

We tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. Here we did not list all the changes but marked in yellow in the revised paper.

We appreciate for Editors/Reviewers’ work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. We are open to any additional comments or concerns you may have regarding this adjustment or any other aspect of the paper. Your feedback is invaluable in improving the quality of our work. Thank you for your support.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions.

Yours sincerely,

Yandong Miao