

**Dear editors and reviewers,**

On behalf of my co-authors, we thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript. We appreciated editor and reviewers very much for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions on our manuscript. These comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our study. We have studied comments carefully and have made corrections in the manuscript.

**Specific Comments to Authors:**

An interesting topic. The patient was fully informed that the author had provided the informed consent form and had obtained ethical approval. This manuscript is smooth, well-structured and easy to read. The selection of variables for comparison is acceptable. The quality of these numbers and tables is all very good. Most references have dates, but some are recent. I think this manuscript can be published. However, the present study was retrospective and single institutional study. Major comments:

1. According to the requirements of the journal, please further include the background to supplement the abstract, not just "Purpose, Method, result, conclusion".

**Response:** Thank you for reminding us. We have already included the background in the abstract section.

2. The introduction section logically describes the relevant background of this study by citing sufficient references. It expresses the purpose of this study through the background description of the incidence of colorectal cancer and magnetic resonance imaging, providing clinical significance for the treatment of colorectal cancer patients. However, there is a lack of the relationship between Dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging and colorectal cancer.

**Response:** Thank you for pointing this out. We added more contents to present the relationship between dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging and colorectal cancer. Please

check added text in the manuscript.

3. The method description is clear and repeatable. But the author wrote, "A total of 86 CRC patients who were admitted into our hospital from January 2022 to January 2024 were recruited." But "our hospital" was not explicitly stated.

**Response:** Thank you for pointing this out. We have already explicitly stated the hospital.

4. Table 1 states " $P < 0.001$ ", but the author describes it as " $P < 0.05$ ". It is suggested that the author make a unified modification.

**Response:** Thank you for reminding us. We have already revised it.

5 Abbreviations in the table need to provide their full names in the table notes, such as CRC, colorectal cancer.

**Response:** According to your suggestion, we provided the full names of the abbreviations in the tables.

6. A total of 29 references were cited in this study. However, after verification, the current format does not meet the requirements of the journal. Please modify them according to the style of the journal.

**Response:** Thank you for pointing this out. We have already modified the reference style to meet the requirements of the journal.

Overall, before colorectal cancer surgery, preoperative assessment can be conducted through dynamic contrast-enhanced magnetic resonance imaging, providing direction for the treatment plan of colorectal cancer.

### **Specific Comments to Authors:**

The manuscript requires the author to make improvements in accordance with the suggestions. In this way, their manuscripts can be published. Therefore, I suggest that authors do some necessary things to achieve their publishing goals. For the abstract section, the objective, method and main findings are clearly stated, emphasizing that the comprehensive diagnosis of DCE-MRI parameters is superior to individual indicators (AUC = 0.863, sensitivity = 82.6%). The introduction part comprehensively expounds the background of the epidemiology, risk factors and the importance of staging of colorectal cancer. Further, through relevant citations, it proves the role of DCE-MRI in oncology and clarifies the novelty of this study in the preoperative staging assessment of colorectal cancer. The author selected 86 patients and elaborated in detail on the inclusion/exclusion criteria, further reducing selection bias. Meanwhile, the author provided detailed figures and tables to show the differences between the colorectal cancer group and the benign tumor group.

1. The abstract lacks demographic details of the patients (such as tumor location and histological subtype), and does not mention the limitations of the study (for example, small sample size and potential bias).

**Response:** Thanks for your suggestion. According to your suggestion, we provided demographic details of the patients and mentioned the limitations of the study in the abstract.

2. The introduction content can better distinguish this study from previous CRC DCE-MRI studies.

**Response:** As you suggested, we added more content to better distinguish this study from previous CRC DCE-MRI studies.

3. The authors did not discuss the limitations of this study and did not provide any subsequent related suggestions. Please clearly point out the limitations of this study in the discussion. Larger

cohort studies need to be proposed in the future.

**Response:** Thank you for pointing this out. We discussed the limitations of this study and provided subsequent related suggestions. Please check revised text in the revised manuscript.

4. The language of the article is relatively weak and the writing needs to be enhanced, such as modifying "The study aims to explore" to "This study aimed to evaluate", "significantly elevated" is more accurate than "notably higher".

**Response:** Sorry for relatively weak language. We carefully proofread the whole text to enhance the readability. We hope the language can meet your expectation.

5. Table 4 states "Spearman correlation analysis", but the main text states "Correlation between". Please have the authors verify the uniformity. The manuscript is acceptable after minor revisions.

**Response:** Thank you for reminding us. We revised it according to your suggestion.

Thank you again for your suggestions and comments.

Your sincerely,

Wang